arXiv:1202.2390v2 [math.AP] 21 Apr 2012

Sufficient and Necessary Criteria for Existence of Pullback Attractors for Non-compact Random Dynamical Systems

Bixiang Wang

Department of Mathematics
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology
Socorro, NM 87801, USA

Email: bwang@nmt.edu

Abstract

We study pullback attractors of non-autonomous non-compact dynamical systems generated by differential equations with non-autonomous deterministic as well as stochastic forcing terms. We first introduce the concepts of pullback attractors and asymptotic compactness for such systems. We then prove a sufficient and necessary condition for existence of pullback attractors. We also introduce the concept of complete orbits for this sort of systems and use these special solutions to characterize the structures of pullback attractors. For random systems containing periodic deterministic forcing terms, we show the pullback attractors are also periodic under certain conditions. As an application of the abstract theory, we prove the existence of a unique pullback attractor for Reaction-Diffusion equations on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with both deterministic and random external terms. Since Sobolev embeddings are not compact on unbounded domains, the uniform estimates on the tails of solutions are employed to establish the asymptotic compactness of solutions.

Key words. Pullback attractor; periodic random attractor; random complete solution; unbounded domain.

MSC 2000. Primary 35B40. Secondary 35B41, 37L30.

1 Introduction

This paper is concerned with the theory of pullback attractors of non-autonomous non-compact dynamical systems generated by differential equations with both non-autonomous deterministic and stochastic forcing terms. We will prove a sufficient and necessary condition for existence of pullback attractors for such systems. We will also introduce the concept of $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbits for random systems and use these special solutions to characterize the structures of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractors. In the deterministic case, the characterization of attractors by complete orbits is well known, see, e.g., [4, 26] for autonomous systems and [11, 12, 13] for non-autonomous systems. However, for random dynamical systems, no such characterization of attractors is available in the literature. For random systems containing periodic deterministic forcing, we prove the pullback attractors are also periodic under some conditions. It seems that periodic random attractors for PDEs was first studied in [17] where a quasigeostrophic flow model was considered. As an application of our abstract results, we will investigate the pullback attractors of the following Reaction-Diffusion equation defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$:

$$du + (\lambda u - \Delta u)dt = f(x,u)dt + g(x,t)dt + h(x)d\omega, \tag{1.1}$$

with initial data $u(x,\tau) = u_\tau(x)$, where $t > \tau$ with $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, λ is a positive constant, $g \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}, L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and $h \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \bigcap W^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $p \geq 2$. f is a smooth nonlinear function satisfying some dissipativeness and growth conditions, and ω is a two-sided real-valued Wiener process on a probability space. The reader is also referred to [33] for existence of periodic random attractors for the Navier-Stokes equations, and to [34] for bifurcation of random periodic solutions for parabolic equations.

Stochastic equations like (1.1) have been used as models to study the phenomena of stochastic resonance in biology and physics, where g is a time-dependent input signal and ω is a Wiener process used to test the impact of stochastic fluctuations on g. In this respect, we refer the reader to [19, 23, 27, 28, 36, 37] for more details, where the authors have demonstrated that, under certain circumstances, the noise can help the system to detect weak signals. This is an interesting phenomenon because noise is generally considered as a nuisance in the process of signal transmission. In the present paper, we will investigate the long term behavior of stochastic equations like (1.1), especially the pullback attractors of the equation.

The concept of pullback attractors for random dynamical systems was introduced by the authors in [16, 18, 24], and the existence of such attractors for compact systems was established in [1, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24] and the references therein. By a compact random dynamical system, we mean the system has a compact pullback absorbing set. The results of [16, 18, 24] can be used to show the existence of pullback attractors for many PDEs defined in bounded domains. However, these results do not apply to PDEs defined on unbounded domains or to weakly dissipative PDEs even defined in bounded domains. The reason is simply because the dynamical systems generated by the equations in such a case are no longer compact. To solve the problem, the authors of [5] introduced the concept of asymptotic compactness for random dynamical systems which is an extension of deterministic systems. This type of asymptotic compactness does not require a system to have a compact pullback absorbing set, and hence it works for dissipative ODEs on infinite lattices as well as PDEs on unbounded domains, see e.g., [5, 6, 30, 31, 32]. In this paper, we will further extend the concept of asymptotic compactness to the case of differential equations with both non-autonomous deterministic and random forcing terms, and as an example, prove the existence of pullback attractors for equation (1.1) defined on the unbounded domain $\mathbb{R}^n$.

In order to deal with pullback attractors for equations like (1.1), we need to introduce the concept of cocycles over two parametric spaces Ω_1 and Ω_2 (see Definition 2.1 below), where Ω_1 is responsible for the non-autonomous deterministic forcing terms and Ω_2 is responsible for the stochastic forcing terms. This kind of cocycle is an extension of the classical non-autonomous deterministic cocycles (see, e.g., [9, 10, 11, 12, 35]) as well as the random cocycles (see, e.g., [1, 16, 18, 24]). More precisely, if Ω_2 is a singleton, then Definition 2.1 reduces to the concept of non-autonomous deterministic cocycles; if Ω_1 is a singleton instead, the definition reduces to that of random cocycles; if both Ω_1 and Ω_2 are singletons, we get the autonomous dynamical systems as discussed in [3, 20, 25, 26]. In the case where the non-autonomous deterministic terms are periodic, we will examine the periodicity of the pullback attractors. To this end, we introduce the concept of periodic cocycles in Definition 2.2. To define a pullback attractor, as usual, we need to specify its attraction domain which, in general, is a collection $\mathcal{D}$ of some families of nonempty sets. In the next section, we will extend the concepts of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing sets, $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotic compactness and $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractors to the cocycles with two parametric spaces, and then prove a sufficient and necessary condition for existence of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractors for such cocycles (see Theorem 2.23 below). When a cocycle is T-periodic, we will show its $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor is also T-periodic under some conditions (see Theorems 2.24 and 2.25). In order to characterize the structures of pullback attractors, we introduce the concept of $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbit of cocycle. As demonstrated by Theorems 2.23 and 2.24, the structure of a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor is fully determined by the $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbits. It seems that the concept of $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbit of cocycle was not introduced in the literature before, and was not used to describe the structures of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback random attractors.

Section 3 is devoted to applications of Theorems 2.23, 2.24 and 2.25 to the cocycles generated by differential equations with deterministic and random forcing terms. Particularly, we discuss how to choose the parametric space Ω_1 for non-autonomous deterministic terms so that the solution operators of an equation can be formulated into the setting of cocycles presented in Section 2. As we will see, there are at least two options for choosing the space Ω_1. We may take Ω_1 either as the set of all initial times (i.e., $\Omega_1 = \mathbb{R}$) or as the set of all translations of the deterministic terms. We further demonstrate that the results obtained by these two approaches are essentially the same. By appropriately choosing Ω_1 and Ω_2, we show that the classical existence results of attractors are covered by Theorems 2.23 and 2.24 as special cases. We will emphasize the definitions of $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbits for different parametric spaces.

In the last section, we prove the existence of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractors for equation (1.1) on $\mathbb{R}^n$ by using the results obtained in Sections 2 and 3. Since the domain $\mathbb{R}^n$ is unbounded and Sobolev embeddings are not compact in this case, we have to appeal to the idea of uniform estimates on the tails of solutions to establish the $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotic compactness of the equation. This idea can be found in [29] for autonomous equations and in [35] for non-autonomous deterministic equations and in [5, 6] for random equations with only stochastic forcing terms. The existence of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor for equation (1.1) presented in Section 4 is an extension of those results from [6, 35].

Throughout the rest of this paper, we use $\|\cdot\|$ and $(\cdot,\cdot)$ to denote the norm and the inner product of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, respectively. The norm of $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is written as $\|\cdot\|_p$ and the norm of a Banach space X is written as $\|\cdot\|_X$. The letters c and c_i $(i = 1, 2, \ldots)$ are generic positive constants which may change their values occasionally.

2 Pullback Attractors for Cocycles

In this section, we discuss the theory of pullback attractors for random dynamical systems which is applicable to differential equations with both non-autonomous deterministic and random terms. This is an extension of the theory for random systems with only stochastic terms as developed in [5, 15, 16, 18, 24]. Our treatment is closest to that of [5, 18]. The reader is also referred to [3, 4, 20, 25, 26] for the attractors theory for autonomous dynamical systems.

Let Ω_1 be a nonempty set, $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P)$ be a probability space, and (X, d) be a complete separable metric space with Borel σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}(X)$. If $x \in X$ and $B \subseteq X$, we write $d(x, B) = \inf\{d(x, b) : b \in B\}$. If $B \subseteq X$ and $C \subseteq X$, we write $d(C, B) = \sup\{d(x, B) : x \in C\}$ for the Hausdorff semi-metric between C and B. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ and $B \subseteq X$, the open ε-neighborhood of B in X is denoted by

$$\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(B) = \{x \in X : d(x, B) < \varepsilon\}.$$

Let 2^X be the collection of all subsets of X. A set-valued mapping $K : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \to 2^X$ is called measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_2$ in Ω_2 if the value $K(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ is a closed nonempty subset of X for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, and the mapping $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2 \to d(x, K(\omega_1, \omega_2))$ is $(\mathcal{F}_2,\ \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$-measurable for every fixed $x \in X$ and $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$. In this case, we also say the family, $\{K(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\}$, consisting of all values of K, is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_2$ in Ω_2.

Suppose that there are two groups $\{\theta_1(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ and $\{\theta_2(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ acting on Ω_1 and Ω_2, respectively. More precisely, $\theta_1 : \mathbb{R}\times\Omega_1 \to \Omega_1$ is a mapping such that $\theta_1(0,\cdot)$ is the identity on Ω_1, $\theta_1(s+t,\cdot) = \theta_1(t,\cdot)\circ\theta_1(s,\cdot)$ for all $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$. Similarly, $\theta_2 : \mathbb{R}\times\Omega_2 \to \Omega_2$ is a $(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})\times\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$-measurable mapping such that $\theta_2(0,\cdot)$ is the identity on Ω_2, $\theta_2(s+t,\cdot) = \theta_2(t,\cdot)\circ\theta_2(s,\cdot)$ for all $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $P\theta_2(t,\cdot) = P$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For convenience, we often write $\theta_1(t,\cdot)$ and $\theta_2(t,\cdot)$ as $\theta_{1,t}$ and $\theta_{2,t}$, respectively. In the sequel, we will call both $(\Omega_1, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ a parametric dynamical system.

Definition 2.1. Let $(\Omega_1, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ be parametric dynamical systems. A mapping Φ: $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \times X \to X$ is called a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega_1, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ if for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$, $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$ and $t, \tau \in \mathbb{R}^+$, the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) $\Phi(\cdot, \omega_1, \cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega_2 \times X \to X$ is $(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+) \times \mathcal{F}_2 \times \mathcal{B}(X),\ \mathcal{B}(X))$-measurable;

(ii) $\Phi(0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \cdot)$ is the identity on X;

(iii) $\Phi(t+\tau, \omega_1, \omega_2, \cdot) = \Phi(t, \theta_{1,\tau}\omega_1, \theta_{2,\tau}\omega_2, \cdot) \circ \Phi(\tau, \omega_1, \omega_2, \cdot)$;

(iv) $\Phi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2, \cdot) : X \to X$ is continuous.

In this section, we always assume that Φ is a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega_1, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$. The purpose of this section is to study the dynamics of continuous cocycles on X, including the periodic ones. The periodic cocycles are defined as follows.

Definition 2.2. Let T be a positive number and Φ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega_1, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$. We say Φ is a continuous periodic cocycle on X with period T if for every $t \geq 0$, $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, there holds

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2, \cdot) = \Phi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2, \cdot).$$

Let D be a family of some subsets of X which is parametrized by $(\omega_1, \omega_2) \in \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$: $D = \{D(\omega_1, \omega_2) \subseteq X : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1,\ \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\}$. Then we can associate with D a set-valued map $f_D : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \to 2^X$ such that $f_D(\omega_1, \omega_2) = D(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$. It is clear that $D = f_D(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)$. We say two such families B and D are equal if and only if the corresponding maps f_B and f_D are equal. In other words, we have the following definition.

Definition 2.3. Let B and D be two families of subsets of X which are parametrized by $(\omega_1, \omega_2) \in \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$. Then B and D are said to be equal if $B(\omega_1, \omega_2) = D(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$.

In the sequel, we use $\mathcal{D}$ to denote a collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X:

$$\mathcal{D} = \{D = \{\emptyset \neq D(\omega_1, \omega_2) \subseteq X : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1,\ \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} : f_D \text{ satisfies some conditions}\}. \tag{2.1}$$

Note that a family D belongs to $\mathcal{D}$ if and only the corresponding map f_D satisfies certain conditions rather than the image $f_D(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)$ of f_D. We will discuss existence of attractors for Φ which pullback attract all elements of $\mathcal{D}$. To this end, we require that the collection $\mathcal{D}$ is neighborhood closed in the following sense.

Definition 2.4. A collection $\mathcal{D}$ of some families of nonempty subsets of X is said to be neighborhood closed if for each $D = \{D(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$, there exists a positive number ε depending on D such that the family

$$\{B(\omega_1, \omega_2) : B(\omega_1, \omega_2) \text{ is a nonempty subset of } \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(D(\omega_1, \omega_2)), \forall\ \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \forall\ \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \tag{2.2}$$

also belongs to $\mathcal{D}$.

Note that the neighborhood closedness of $\mathcal{D}$ implies for each $D \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\{\tilde{D}(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \tilde{D}(\omega_1, \omega_2) \text{ is a nonempty subset of } D(\omega_1, \omega_2), \forall\ \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \forall\ \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}. \tag{2.3}$$

A collection $\mathcal{D}$ satisfying (2.3) is said to be inclusion-closed in the literature, see, e.g., [18]. The concept of inclusion-closedness of $\mathcal{D}$ is used to find a sufficient condition for existence of a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor. In the present paper, we want to investigate both sufficient and necessary criteria for existence of such attractors. As we will see later, we need the concept of neighborhood closedness of $\mathcal{D}$ in order to derive a necessary condition for the existence of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractors. It is evident that the neighborhood closedness of $\mathcal{D}$ implies the inclusion-closedness of $\mathcal{D}$.

When we study the dynamics of periodic cocycles, we require that the collection $\mathcal{D}$ is closed under translations as defined below. Let $T \in \mathbb{R}$ and $D = \{D(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$. For each $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, define a set $D_T(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ by

$$D_T(\omega_1, \omega_2) = D(\theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2). \tag{2.4}$$

Let D_T be the collection of all $D_T(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ as defined by (2.4), that is,

$$D_T = \{D_T(\omega_1, \omega_2) : D_T(\omega_1, \omega_2) \text{ is given by (2.4)}, \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\}. \tag{2.5}$$

Then the family D_T given by (2.5) is called the T-translation of $D \in \mathcal{D}$. Note that, as sets, D_T and D are equal for any $D \in \mathcal{D}$. However, in general, D_T and D are not equal in terms of Definition 2.3.

Definition 2.5. Suppose $T \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ is a collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X as given by (2.1). Let $\mathcal{D}_T$ be the collection of T-translations of all elements of $\mathcal{D}$, that is,

$$\mathcal{D}_T = \{D_T : D_T \text{ is the } T\text{-translation of } D, \ D \in \mathcal{D}\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{D}_T$ is called the T-translation of $\mathcal{D}$. If $\mathcal{D}_T \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, we say $\mathcal{D}$ is T-translation closed. If $\mathcal{D}_T = \mathcal{D}$, we say $\mathcal{D}$ is T-translation invariant.

Regarding T-translations, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose $T \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ is a collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X as given by* (2.1)*. Then $\mathcal{D}_{-T} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ if and only if $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_T$.*

Proof. It follows from Definition 2.5 that, for every $B \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$(B_T)_{-T} = (B_{-T})_T = B, \tag{2.6}$$

where B_T and B_{-T} are T-translation and $-T$-translation of B, respectively. Note that (2.6) should be understood in the sense of Definition 2.3. Suppose $\mathcal{D}_{-T} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ and $B \in \mathcal{D}$. Then we have $B_{-T} \in \mathcal{D}$ and hence $(B_{-T})_T \in \mathcal{D}_T$, which along with (2.6) shows that $B \in \mathcal{D}_T$. Since B is an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{D}$ we get $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_T$.

We now suppose $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_T$ and $B \in \mathcal{D}_{-T}$. Then there exists $E \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $B = E_{-T}$. By $E \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_T$, we find that there exists $G \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $E = G_T$. It follows from (2.6) that $B = E_{-T} = (G_T)_{-T} = G$. Since $G \in \mathcal{D}$ we have $B \in \mathcal{D}$. Since B is an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{D}_{-T}$ we get $\mathcal{D}_{-T} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. This completes the proof. □

As an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.6 and Definition 2.5, we have the following invariance criterion for $\mathcal{D}$.

Lemma 2.7. *Suppose $T \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ is a collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X as given by* (2.1)*. Then $\mathcal{D}$ is T-translation invariant if and only if $\mathcal{D}$ is both T-translation closed and $-T$-translation closed.*

For later purpose, we need the concept of a complete orbit of Φ which is given below.

Definition 2.8. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X. A mapping $\psi : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \to X$ is called a complete orbit of Φ if for every $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $t \geq 0$, $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, the following holds:

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{1,\tau}\omega_1, \theta_{2,\tau}\omega_2, \psi(\tau, \omega_1, \omega_2)) = \psi(t + \tau, \omega_1, \omega_2). \tag{2.7}$$

If, in addition, there exists $D = \{D(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\psi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ belongs to $D(\theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2)$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, then ψ is called a $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbit of Φ.

The following are the concepts regarding invariance of a family of subsets of X.

Definition 2.9. Let $B = \{B(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1,\ \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\}$ be a family of nonempty subsets of X. We say that B is positively invariant under Φ if

$$\Phi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2, B(\omega_1, \omega_2)) \subseteq B(\theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2), \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0,\ \omega_1 \in \Omega_1,\ \omega_2 \in \Omega_2.$$

We say that B is invariant under Φ if

$$\Phi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2, B(\omega_1, \omega_2)) = B(\theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2), \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0,\ \omega_1 \in \Omega_1,\ \omega_2 \in \Omega_2.$$

We say that B is quasi-invariant under Φ if for each map $y : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \to X$ with $y(\omega_1, \omega_2) \in B(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, there exists a complete orbit ψ such that $\psi(0, \omega_1, \omega_2) = y(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ and $\psi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2) \in B(\theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$.

It can be proved that a family of nonempty subsets of X is invariant under Φ if and only if the family is positively invariant and quasi-invariant, which is given by the following lemma.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $B = \{B(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1,\ \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\}$ be a family of nonempty subsets of X.*

(i) If B is quasi-invariant under Φ, then

$$B(\theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2) \subseteq \Phi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2, B(\omega_1, \omega_2)), \quad \textit{for all } t \geq 0,\ \omega_1 \in \Omega_1,\ \omega_2 \in \Omega_2. \tag{2.8}$$

(ii) If B is invariant under Φ, then B is quasi-invariant under Φ.

(iii) B is invariant under Φ if and only if B is positively invariant and quasi-invariant.

Proof. (i). Suppose B is quasi-invariant under Φ. We want to show (2.8). Let $t \geq 0$ be fixed. For each $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, let $y(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ be an arbitrary element in $B(\omega_1, \omega_2)$. Then the quasi-invariance of B implies that there exists a complete orbit ψ such that $\psi(0, \omega_1, \omega_2) = y(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ and $\psi(s, \omega_1, \omega_2) \in B(\theta_{1,s}\omega_1, \theta_{2,s}\omega_2)$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$. Furthermore, for each $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, we have

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2, \psi(-t, \omega_1, \omega_2)) = \psi(0, \omega_1, \omega_2),$$

which implies that

$$\Phi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2, \psi(-t, \theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2)) = \psi(0, \theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{1,t}\omega_2). \tag{2.9}$$

Since $\psi(0, \theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2) = y(\theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{1,t}\omega_2)$ and $\psi(-t, \theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2) \in B(\omega_1, \omega_2)$, we obtain (2.8) from (2.9) immediately.

(ii). Suppose that B is invariant and $y : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \to X$ is a mapping such that $y(\omega_1, \omega_2) \in B(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$. Then we need to show that there exists a complete orbit ψ such that $\psi(0, \omega_1, \omega_2) = y(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ and $\psi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2) \in B(\theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$. Fix $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$. We first construct a mapping $\psi(\cdot, \omega_1, \omega_2) : \mathbb{R} \to X$ with desired properties. By the invariance of B we have, for all $t \geq 0$, $\tilde{\omega}_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\tilde{\omega}_2 \in \Omega_2$,

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}\tilde{\omega}_1, \theta_{2,-t}\tilde{\omega}_2, B(\theta_{1,-t}\tilde{\omega}_1, \theta_{2,-t}\tilde{\omega}_2)) = B(\tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2). \tag{2.10}$$

Since $y(\omega_1, \omega_2) \in B(\omega_1, \omega_2)$, it follows from (2.10) with $t = 1$ that there exists $z_1 \in B(\theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-1}\omega_2)$ such that

$$\Phi(1, \theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-1}\omega_2, z_1) = y(\omega_1, \omega_2). \tag{2.11}$$

By (2.11) and the cocycle property of Φ we get that, for all $t \geq 1$,

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-1}\omega_2, z_1) = \Phi(t-1, \omega_1, \omega_2, \Phi(1, \theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-1}\omega_2, z_1)) = \Phi(t-1, \omega_1, \omega_2, y(\omega_1, \omega_2)).$$

Note that the invariance of B implies $\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-1}\omega_2, z_1) \in B(\theta_{1,t-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t-1}\omega_2)$. Replacing $\tilde{\omega}_1$ and $\tilde{\omega}_2$ in (2.10) by $\theta_{1,-1}\omega_1$ and $\theta_{2,-1}\omega_2$, respectively, we get, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t-1}\omega_2, B(\theta_{1,-t-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t-1}\omega_2)) = B(\theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-1}\omega_2). \tag{2.12}$$

Since $z_1 \in B(\theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-1}\omega_2)$, from (2.12) with $t = 1$ we find that there exists $z_2 \in B(\theta_{1,-2}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-2}\omega_2)$ such that

$$\Phi(1, \theta_{1,-2}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-2}\omega_2, z_2) = z_1,$$

which along with the cocycle property of Φ implies that, for all $t \geq 1$,

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-2}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-2}\omega_2, z_2) = \Phi(t-1, \theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-1}\omega_2, z_1).$$

The invariance of B again implies $\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-2}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-2}\omega_2, z_2) \in B(\theta_{1,t-2}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t-2}\omega_2)$. Proceeding inductively, we find that for every $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, there exists $z_n \in B(\theta_{1,-n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-n}\omega_2)$ such that $\Phi(n, \theta_{1,-n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-n}\omega_2, z_n) = y(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ and for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-n}\omega_2, z_n) \in B(\theta_{1,t-n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t-n}\omega_2). \tag{2.13}$$

In addition, for all $t \geq 1$, we have

$$\Phi(t-1, \theta_{1,-n+1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-n+1}\omega_2, z_{n-1}) = \Phi(t, \theta_{1,-n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-n}\omega_2, z_n).$$

Define a map $\psi(\cdot, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ from $\mathbb{R}$ into X such that for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\psi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ is the common value of $\Phi(t+n, \theta_{1,-n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-n}\omega_2, z_n)$ for all $n \geq -t$. Then we have $\psi(0, \omega_1, \omega_2) = y(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ and $\psi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2) \in B(\theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2)$ by (2.13). If $t \geq 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \geq -\tau$, by definition we find that

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{1,\tau}\omega_1, \theta_{2,\tau}\omega_2, \psi(\tau, \omega_1, \omega_2)) = \Phi(t, \theta_{1,\tau}\omega_1, \theta_{2,\tau}\omega_2, \Phi(\tau + n, \theta_{1,-n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-n}\omega_2, z_n))$$

$$= \Phi(t + \tau + n, \theta_{1,-n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-n}\omega_2, z_n) = \psi(t + \tau, \omega_1, \omega_2).$$

So, ψ is a complete orbit of Φ with desired properties and thus B is quasi-invariant.

Note that (iii) follows from (i) and (ii) immediately and thus the proof is completed. □

Definition 2.11. Let $B = \{B(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1,\ \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\}$ be a family of nonempty subsets of X. For every $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, let

$$\Omega(B, \omega_1, \omega_2) = \bigcap_{\tau \geq 0} \overline{\bigcup_{t \geq \tau} \Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2, B(\theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2))}. \tag{2.14}$$

Then the family $\{\Omega(B, \omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\}$ is called the Ω-limit set of B and is denoted by $\Omega(B)$.

Remark 2.12. Given $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, it follows from (2.14) that a point $y \in X$ belongs to $\Omega(B, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ if and only if there exist two sequences $t_n \to \infty$ and $x_n \in B(\theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2)$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \Phi(t_n, \theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2, x_n) = y.$$

Definition 2.13. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X and $K = \{K(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1,\ \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$. Then K is called a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set for Φ if for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$, $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$ and for every $B \in \mathcal{D}$, there exists $T = T(B, \omega_1, \omega_2) > 0$ such that

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2, B(\theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2)) \subseteq K(\omega_1, \omega_2) \quad \text{for all } t \geq T. \tag{2.15}$$

If, in addition, for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, $K(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ is a closed nonempty subset of X and K is measurable with respect to the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$ in Ω_2, then we say K is a closed measurable $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set for Φ.

Definition 2.14. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X. Then Φ is said to be $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X if for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, the sequence

$$\{\Phi(t_n, \theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2, x_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{ has a convergent subsequence in } X \tag{2.16}$$

whenever $t_n \to \infty$, and $x_n \in B(\theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2)$ with $\{B(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1,\ \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$.

Definition 2.15. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X and $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is called a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor for Φ if the following conditions (i)-(iii) are fulfilled:

(i) $\mathcal{A}$ is measurable with respect to the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$ in Ω_2 and $\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ is compact for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$.

(ii) $\mathcal{A}$ is invariant, that is, for every $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$,

$$\Phi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2, \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)) = \mathcal{A}(\theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2), \quad \forall\, t \geq 0.$$

(iii) $\mathcal{A}$ attracts every member of $\mathcal{D}$, that is, for every $B = \{B(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$ and for every $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} d(\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2, B(\theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2)), \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)) = 0.$$

If, in addition, there exists $T > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}(\theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2) = \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2), \quad \forall\, \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \forall\, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2,$$

then we say $\mathcal{A}$ is periodic with period T.

From Definition 2.15, the following observation is evident.

Remark 2.16. The $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor of Φ, if it exists, must be unique within the collection $\mathcal{D}$. In other words, if $\{\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$ are both $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractors for Φ, then we must have $\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$. This follows immediately from conditions (i)-(iii) in Definition 2.15. Furthermore, If $\mathcal{A}$ is a periodic $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor of Φ with period $T > 0$, then we have

$$\mathcal{A}(\theta_{1,-T}\omega_1, \omega_2) = \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2), \quad \forall\, \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \forall\, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2,$$

We next discuss the properties of Ω-limit sets of a family of subsets of X.

Lemma 2.17. *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X and Φ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega_1, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$. Suppose Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X. Then the following statements are true:*

(i) For every $D \in \mathcal{D}$, $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, the Ω-limit set $\Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ is nonempty, compact and attracts D.

(ii) For every $D \in \mathcal{D}$, the Ω-limit set $\Omega(D) = \{\Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\}$ is quasi-invariant.

(iii) Let $D = \{D(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\}$ belong to $\mathcal{D}$ with $D(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ being closed in X for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$. If for each $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, there exists $t_0 = t_0(D, \omega_1, \omega_2) \geq 0$ such that $\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2, D(\theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2)) \subseteq D(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ for all $t \geq t_0$, then the Ω-limit set $\Omega(D)$ is invariant. In addition, $\Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2) \subseteq D(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$.

Proof. (i). Let $t_n \to \infty$ and $x_n \in D(\theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2)$. Then the $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotic compactness of Φ implies that there exists $y \in X$ such that, up to a subsequence,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Phi(t_n, \theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2, x_n) = y,$$

which along with Remark 2.12 shows that $y \in \Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ and hence $\Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ is nonempty for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$.

Let $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in $\Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)$. It follows from Remark 2.12 that there exist $t_n \to \infty$ and $x_n \in D(\theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2)$ such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$d(\Phi(t_n, \theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2, x_n),\ y_n) \leq \frac{1}{n}. \tag{2.17}$$

By the $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotic compactness of Φ we find that there exists $y \in X$ such that, up to a subsequence,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Phi(t_n, \theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2, x_n) = y,$$

which together with Remark 2.12 and inequality (2.17) implies that $y \in \Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ and $y_n \to y$. Therefore, $\Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ is compact for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$.

We now prove that for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} d(\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2, D(\theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2)),\ \Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)) = 0. \tag{2.18}$$

Suppose (2.18) is not true. Then there exist $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$, $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $t_n \to \infty$ and $x_n \in D(\theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2)$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$d(\Phi(t_n, \theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2, x_n),\ \Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)) \geq \varepsilon_0. \tag{2.19}$$

By the $\mathcal{D}$-pullback compactness of Φ and Remark 2.12, there exist $y \in \Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ such that, up to a subsequence, $\Phi(t_n, \theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2, x_n) \to y$. On the other hand, it follows from (2.19) that $d(y,\ \Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)) \geq \varepsilon_0$, a contradiction with $y \in \Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)$. This proves (2.18).

(ii). Let $y : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \to X$ be a mapping such that $y(\omega_1, \omega_2) \in \Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$. Then we need to show that there exists a complete orbit ψ such that $\psi(0, \omega_1, \omega_2) = y(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ and $\psi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2) \in \Omega(D, \theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$. Fix $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$. We first construct a mapping $\psi_{\omega_1,\omega_2} : \mathbb{R} \to X$ such that $\psi_{\omega_1,\omega_2}(0) = y(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ and $\psi_{\omega_1,\omega_2}(t) \in \Omega(D, \theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $y(\omega_1, \omega_2) \in \Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)$, by Remark 2.12 we find that there exist $t_n \to \infty$ and $x_n \in D(\theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Phi(t_n, \theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2, x_n) = y(\omega_1, \omega_2). \tag{2.20}$$

By (2.20) and the continuity of Φ we have, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Phi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2, \Phi(t_n, \theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2, x_n)) = \Phi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2, y(\omega_1, \omega_2)).$$

Then the cocycle property of Φ implies that, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Phi(t_n + t, \theta_{1,-t_n-t}\theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n-t}\theta_{2,t}\omega_2, x_n)) = \Phi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2, y(\omega_1, \omega_2)). \tag{2.21}$$

It follows from (2.21) and Remark 2.12 that, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\Phi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2, y(\omega_1, \omega_2)) \in \Omega(D, \theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2).$$

Let N_1 be large enough such that $t_n \geq 1$ for $n \geq N_1$. Consider the sequence $\Phi(t_n - 1, \theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2, x_n)$ $= \Phi(t_n - 1, \theta_{1,-t_n+1}\theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n+1}\theta_{2,-1}\omega_2, x_n)$. Then the $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotic compactness of Φ implies that there exists $y_1 \in X$ and a subsequence, which is still denoted by the same one, such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Phi(t_n - 1, \theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2, x_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \Phi(t_n - 1, \theta_{1,-t_n+1}\theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n+1}\theta_{2,-1}\omega_2, x_n) = y_1. \tag{2.22}$$

By (2.22) and Remark 2.12 we have $y_1 \in \Omega(D, \theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-1}\omega_2)$. By the continuity of Φ again, we get that, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Phi(t, \theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-1}\omega_2, \Phi(t_n - 1, \theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2, x_n)) = \Phi(t, \theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-1}\omega_2, y_1),$$

which along with the cocycle property of Φ shows that, for $t \geq 0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Phi(t_n + t - 1, \theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2, x_n) = \Phi(t, \theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-1}\omega_2, y_1). \tag{2.23}$$

By (2.23) and Remark 2.12 we obtain that, for $t \geq 0$,

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-1}\omega_2, y_1) \in \Omega(D, \theta_{1,t-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t-1}\omega_2).$$

On the other hand, it follows from (2.21) that, for all $t \geq 1$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Phi(t_n + t - 1, \theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2, x_n) = \Phi(t-1, \omega_1, \omega_2, y(\omega_1, \omega_2)). \tag{2.24}$$

By (2.23)-(2.24) we get, for all $t \geq 1$,

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-1}\omega_2, y_1) = \Phi(t-1, \omega_1, \omega_2, y(\omega_1, \omega_2)).$$

In particular, for $t = 1$ we have $y(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \Phi(1, \theta_{1,-1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-1}\omega_2, y_1)$. Continuing this process, by a diagonal argument, we find that for every $m = 1, 2, \ldots$, there exists $y_m \in \Omega(D, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2)$ such that $\Phi(m, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2, y_m) = y(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ and for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2, y_m) \in \Omega(D, \theta_{1,t-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t-m}\omega_2). \tag{2.25}$$

Furthermore, for all $t \geq 1$, we have

$$\Phi(t-1, \theta_{1,-m+1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m+1}\omega_2, y_{m-1}) = \Phi(t, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2, y_m).$$

We now define a mapping $\psi_{\omega_1,\omega_2} : \mathbb{R} \to X$ such that for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\psi_{\omega_1,\omega_2}(t)$ is the common value of $\Phi(t+m, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2, y_m)$ for all $m \geq -t$. Then we have $\psi_{\omega_1,\omega_2}(0) = y(\omega_1, \omega_2)$. It also follows from (2.25) that $\psi_{\omega_1,\omega_2}(t) \in \Omega(D, \theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. If $t \geq 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m \geq -\tau$, by the definition of ψ_{ω_1,ω_2} we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(t, \theta_{1,\tau}\omega_1, \theta_{2,\tau}\omega_2, \psi_{\omega_1,\omega_2}(\tau)) &= \Phi(t, \theta_{1,\tau}\omega_1, \theta_{2,\tau}\omega_2, \Phi(\tau + m, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2, y_m)) \\ &= \Phi(t + \tau + m, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2, y_m) = \psi_{\omega_1,\omega_2}(t+\tau). \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

Let $\psi : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \to X$ be the map given by $\psi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2) = \psi_{\omega_1,\omega_2}(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$. It follows from (2.26) that ψ is a complete orbit of Φ. In addition, $\psi(0, \omega_1, \omega_2) = y(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ and $\psi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2) \in \Omega(D, \theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. This shows that $\Omega(D)$ is quasi-invariant under Φ.

(iii). We now prove the invariance of $\Omega(D)$. By the quasi-invariance (ii) of $\Omega(D)$ and Lemma 2.10 we get that, for every $t \geq 0$, $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$,

$$\Omega(D, \theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2) \subseteq \Phi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2, \Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)). \tag{2.27}$$

We now prove the converse inclusion relation of (2.27). Note that (2.27) implies that, for all $r \geq 0$, $\Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2) \subseteq \Phi(r, \theta_{1,-r}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-r}\omega_2, \Omega(D, \theta_{1,-r}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-r}\omega_2))$ and therefore for every $t \geq 0$ and $r \geq 0$,

$$\Phi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2, \Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)) \subseteq \Phi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2, \Phi(r, \theta_{1,-r}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-r}\omega_2, \Omega(D, \theta_{1,-r}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-r}\omega_2)))$$

$$= \Phi(t+r, \theta_{1,-r}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-r}\omega_2, \Omega(D, \theta_{1,-r}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-r}\omega_2))$$

$$= \Phi(s, \theta_{1,-s}\theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-s}\theta_{2,t}\omega_2, \Omega(D, \theta_{1,-s}\theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-s}\theta_{2,t}\omega_2)), \tag{2.28}$$

where $s = t + r$. Note that $\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2, D(\theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t})) \subseteq D(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ for all $t \geq t_0$, and hence, by Definition 2.11 we get

$$\Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2) \subseteq \overline{\bigcup_{t \geq t_0} \Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2, D(\theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2))} \subseteq \overline{D(\omega_1, \omega_2)} = D(\omega_1, \omega_2). \tag{2.29}$$

Here we have used the assumption that $D(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ is closed in X. It follows from (2.18) and (2.29) that

$$\lim_{s \to \infty} d(\Phi(s, \theta_{1,-s}\theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-s}\theta_{2,t}\omega_2, \Omega(D, \theta_{1,-s}\theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-s}\theta_{2,t}\omega_2)), \Omega(D, \theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2)) = 0. \tag{2.30}$$

By (2.28) and (2.30) we get

$$d(\Phi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2, \Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)), \Omega(D, \theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2)) = 0,$$

and hence we have $\Phi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2, \Omega(D, \omega_1, \omega_2)) \subseteq \Omega(D, \theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2)$, from which and (2.27) the invariance of $\Omega(D)$ follows. The invariance of $\Omega(D)$ and (2.29) yield (iii). □

As stated below, the structure of the $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor of Φ is fully determined by the $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbits.

Lemma 2.18. *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X and Φ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega_1, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$. Suppose that Φ has a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$. Then, for every $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$,*

$$\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \{\psi(0, \omega_1, \omega_2) : \psi \textit{ is a } \mathcal{D}\textit{-complete orbit of } \Phi\}.$$

Proof. Given $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, let $B(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ be the set consisting of all $\psi(0, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ for $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbits ψ. We first prove $B(\omega_1, \omega_2) \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)$. Let $y \in B(\omega_1, \omega_2)$. Then there exist $D \in \mathcal{D}$ and a complete orbit ψ such that $y = \psi(0, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ and $\psi(t, \omega_1, \omega_2) \in D(\theta_{1,t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,t}\omega_2)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. By the attraction property of $\mathcal{A}$ we have

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} d(\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2, D(\theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2)), \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)) = 0,$$

which implies that

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} d(\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2, \psi(-t, \omega_1, \omega_2)), \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)) = 0. \tag{2.31}$$

It follows from (2.7) and (2.31) that $d(\psi(0,\omega_1,\omega_2),\mathcal{A}(\omega_1,\omega_2)) = 0$, and hence $y = \psi(0,\omega_1,\omega_2) \in \mathcal{A}(\omega_1,\omega_2)$. This shows that $B(\omega_1,\omega_2) \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\omega_1,\omega_2)$.

We next prove $\mathcal{A}(\omega_1,\omega_2) \subseteq B(\omega_1,\omega_2)$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is invariant, by Lemma 2.10 we find that $\mathcal{A}$ is quasi-invariant. Therefore, given $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$, $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$ and $y(\omega_1,\omega_2) \in \mathcal{A}(\omega_1,\omega_2)$ there exists a complete orbit ψ such that $\psi(0,\omega_1,\omega_2) = y(\omega_1,\omega_2)$ and $\psi(t,\omega_1,\omega_2) \in \mathcal{A}(\theta_{1,t}\omega_1,\theta_{2,t}\omega_2)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{D}$, we see that ψ is a $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbit. Therefore, by definition, $y(\omega_1,\omega_2) = \psi(0,\omega_1,\omega_2) \in B(\omega_1,\omega_2)$. This proves $\mathcal{A}(\omega_1,\omega_2) \subseteq B(\omega_1,\omega_2)$. □

Lemma 2.19. *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X and Φ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega_1,\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2,\mathcal{F}_2,P,\{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$. Suppose that Φ has a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}(\omega_1,\omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$. Then Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X.*

Proof. Let $t_n \to \infty$, $B \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x_n \in B(\theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1,\theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2)$. We will show that the sequence $\{\Phi(t_n,\theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1,\theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2,x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ has a convergent subsequence in X. By the attraction property of $\mathcal{A}$, for every $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$, $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $z_m \in \mathcal{A}(\omega_1,\omega_2)$ and $t_{n_m} \in \{t_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ with $t_{n_m} \geq m$ and $x_{n_m} \in \{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that

$$d(\Phi(t_{n_m},\theta_{1,-t_{n_m}}\omega_1,\theta_{2,-t_{n_m}}\omega_2,x_{n_m}),z_m) \leq \frac{1}{m}. \tag{2.32}$$

The compactness of $\mathcal{A}(\omega_1,\omega_2)$ implies that $\{z_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ has a convergent subsequence in X, which along with (2.32) shows that $\Phi(t_{n_m},\theta_{1,-t_{n_m}}\omega_1,\theta_{2,-t_{n_m}}\omega_2,x_{n_m})$ has a convergent subsequence, and hence Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X. □

Lemma 2.20. *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a neighborhood closed collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X, and Φ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega_1,\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2,\mathcal{F}_2,P,\{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$. Suppose that Φ has a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}(\omega_1,\omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$. Then Φ has a closed $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set K that is measurable with respect to the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$ in Ω_2.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ is neighborhood closed, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\{B(\omega_1,\omega_2) : B(\omega_1,\omega_2) \text{ is a nonempty subset of } \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{A}(\omega_1,\omega_2)), \forall\, \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \forall\, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}. \tag{2.33}$$

Choose an arbitrary number $\varepsilon_1 \in (0,\varepsilon)$. Given $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, let $K(\omega_1,\omega_2)$ be the closed neighborhood of $\mathcal{A}(\omega_1,\omega_2)$ with radius ε_1, that is,

$$K(\omega_1,\omega_2) = \{x \in X : \ d(x,\mathcal{A}(\omega_1,\omega_2)) \leq \varepsilon_1\}. \tag{2.34}$$

By (2.33) we have $K = \{K(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$. By the attraction property of $\mathcal{A}$, we find that K is a closed $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set of Φ. We now prove the measurability of K with respect to the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$, that is denoted by $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_2$. Given $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $x \in X$, by the measurability of $\mathcal{A}$ we find the mapping: $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2 \to d(x, \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2))$, is measurable with respect to $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_2$. In addition, the mapping: $x \in X \to d(x, \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2))$ is continuous. Therefore the mapping $(\omega_2, x) \to d(x, \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2))$ is measurable with respect to $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_2 \times \mathcal{B}(X)$. Thus we have the set $\{(\omega_2, x) \in \Omega_2 \times X : \ x \in K(\omega_1, \omega_2)\} = \{(\omega_2, x) \in \Omega_2 \times X : \ d(x, \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)) \leq \varepsilon_1\} \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_2 \times \mathcal{B}(X)$. This shows that the graph of the set-valued mapping: $\omega_2 \to K(\omega_1, \omega_2)$, is in $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_2 \times \mathcal{B}(X)$. Then the measurability of K with respect to $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_2$ follows from Theorem 8.1.4 in [2]. $\square$

Lemma 2.21. *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be an inclusion-closed collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X and Φ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega_1, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$. Suppose that $K = \{K(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2)\} \in \mathcal{D}$ is a closed measurable (w.r.t. the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$) $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set for Φ in $\mathcal{D}$ and Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X. Then Φ has a unique $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$ which is given by, for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$,*

$$\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \Omega(K, \omega_1, \omega_2) = \bigcap_{\tau \geq 0} \overline{\bigcup_{t \geq \tau} \Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2, K(\theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2))}. \tag{2.35}$$

Proof. Note that the uniqueness of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor follows directly from Definition 2.15 as stated in Remark 2.16. Since K is a closed $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set of Φ, it follows from Lemma 2.17 that, for each $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, $\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \Omega(K, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ is a nonempty compact subset of X and $\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) \subset K(\omega_1, \omega_2)$. Since $\mathcal{D}$ is inclusion-closed and $K \in \mathcal{D}$, we see that $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 \in \Omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$. Further, Lemma 2.17 implies that $\mathcal{A}$ is invariant. Therefore, the proof will be completed if we can show the measurability of $\mathcal{A}$ with respect to the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$ and the attraction of $\mathcal{A}$ on all members of $\mathcal{D}$.

We first prove that $\mathcal{A}$ attracts all elements of $\mathcal{D}$. By Lemma 2.17 we find that $\mathcal{A}$ attracts K, that is, given $\varepsilon > 0$, $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, there exists $t_1 = t_1(\varepsilon, \omega_1, \omega_2) > 0$ such that

$$d(\Phi(t_1, \theta_{1,-t_1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_1}\omega_2, K(\theta_{1,-t_1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_1}\omega_2)), \ \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)) < \varepsilon. \tag{2.36}$$

Then by the absorption property of K we get that, for every $D \in \mathcal{D}$, there exists $T = T(D, \omega_1, \omega_2, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that for all $t > T$,

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}(\theta_{1,-t_1}\omega_1), \theta_{2,-t}(\theta_{2,-t_1}\omega_2), D(\theta_{1,-t}(\theta_{1,-t_1}\omega_1), \theta_{2,-t}(\theta_{2,-t_1}\omega_2))) \subseteq K(\theta_{1,-t_1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_1}\omega_2),$$

which implies that, for all $t > T$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Phi(t+t_1, \theta_{1,-t-t_1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t-t_1}\omega_2, D(\theta_{1,-t-t_1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t-t_1}\omega_2)) \\
&= \Phi(t_1, \theta_{1,-t_1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_1}\omega_2, \Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t-t_1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t-t_1}\omega_2, D(\theta_{1,-t-t_1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t-t_1}\omega_2)) \\
&\subseteq \Phi(t_1, \theta_{1,-t_1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_1}\omega_2, K(\theta_{1,-t_1}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_1}\omega_2)).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.37}$$

It follows from (2.36)-(2.37) that, for all $t > T + t_1$,

$$d(\Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2, D(\theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2)),\ \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)) < \varepsilon.$$

This shows that $\mathcal{A}$ attracts all members of $\mathcal{D}$.

We next prove the measurability of $\mathcal{A}$ with respect to the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$. It follows from (2.35) that

$$\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{t \geq n} \Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2, K(\theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2))}, \tag{2.38}$$

where $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By (2.38) we find that, for $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{m=n}^{\infty} \Phi(m, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2, K(\theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2))} \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2). \tag{2.39}$$

On the other hand, since $\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) \subseteq K(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$, we have for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\Phi(m, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2, \mathcal{A}(\theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2)) \subseteq \Phi(m, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2, K(\theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2))$$

which along with the invariance of $\mathcal{A}$ yields that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) \subseteq \Phi(m, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2, K(\theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2)). \tag{2.40}$$

Therefore we get that

$$\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) \subseteq \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{m=n}^{\infty} \Phi(m, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2, K(\theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2))},$$

from which and (2.39) we obtain

$$\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{m=n}^{\infty} \Phi(m, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2, K(\theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2))}. \tag{2.41}$$

By conditions (i) and (iv) in Definition 2.1, and the measurability of θ_2, we find that, for every fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$, the mapping $\Phi(m, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2, x)$ is $(\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{B}(X))$-measurable in ω_2 and is continuous in x. In addition, the set-valued mapping $\omega_2 \to K(\theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2)$ has closed images and is measurable with respect to the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$. Then it follows from [2] (Theorem 8.2.8) that for every fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$, the mapping

$$\omega_2 \to \overline{\Phi(m, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2, K(\theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2))}$$

is measurable with respect to the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$. Therefore, by Theorem 8.2.4 in [2], we find that, for every fixed $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$, the set-valued mapping

$$\omega_2 \to \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{m=n}^{\infty} \overline{\Phi(m, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2, K(\theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2))}}$$

is measurable with respect to the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$, which implies that the mapping

$$\omega_2 \to \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{m=n}^{\infty} \Phi(m, \theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2, K(\theta_{1,-m}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-m}\omega_2))} \tag{2.42}$$

is measurable with respect to the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$. Then, for every fixed $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$, the measurability of $\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \cdot)$ with respect to the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$ follows from (2.41) and (2.42). □

Note that the attractor constructed in Lemma 2.21 is measurable with respect to the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$ rather than $\mathcal{F}_2$ itself. This is because the measurability of the attractor is obtained by using Theorem 8.2.4 in [2], and this theorem requires that the probability space is complete.

Lemma 2.22. *Let all assumptions of Lemma 2.21 hold. Then the unique $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A}$ of Φ in $\mathcal{D}$ can be characterized by, for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$,*

$$\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{D}} \Omega(B, \omega_1, \omega_2), \tag{2.43}$$

where $\Omega(B, \omega_1, \omega_2)$, as given by (2.14), is the Ω-limit set of B corresponding to ω_1 and ω_2.

Proof. It is evident from (2.35) that $\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) \subseteq \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{D}} \Omega(B, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ since the $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set K is in $\mathcal{D}$. So we only need to show the reverse inclusion relation. Let $y \in \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{D}} \Omega(B, \omega_1, \omega_2)$. Then there exists $B \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $y \in \Omega(B, \omega_1, \omega_2)$. It follows from Remark 2.12 that there exist $t_n \to \infty$ and $x_n \in B(\theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Phi(t_n, \theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2, x_n) = y. \tag{2.44}$$

By the attraction property of $\mathcal{A}$ we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} d\left(\Phi(t_n, \theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2, B(\theta_{1,-t_n}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega_2)), \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)\right) = 0. \tag{2.45}$$

From (2.44)-(2.45) we obtain that $d\left(y, \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)\right) = 0$, and hence $y \in \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ due to the compactness of $\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)$. This shows that $\bigcup\limits_{B \in \mathcal{D}} \Omega(B, \omega_1, \omega_2) \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ and thus (2.43) follows. $\square$

From Lemma 2.18 up to Lemma 2.22, we immediately obtain the following main result of this section.

Theorem 2.23. *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a neighborhood closed collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X and Φ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega_1, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}})$. Then Φ has a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X and Φ has a closed measurable (w.r.t. the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$) $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set K in $\mathcal{D}$. The $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A}$ is unique and is given by, for each $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$,*

$$\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \Omega(K, \omega_1, \omega_2) = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{D}} \Omega(B, \omega_1, \omega_2) \tag{2.46}$$

$$= \{\psi(0, \omega_1, \omega_2) : \psi \text{ is a } \mathcal{D}-\text{complete orbit of } \Phi\}. \tag{2.47}$$

We now prove the periodicity of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback of attractors for a periodic cocycle under certain conditions.

Theorem 2.24. *Suppose Φ is a continuous periodic cocycle with period $T > 0$ on X over $(\Omega_1, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}})$. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a neighborhood closed and T-translation invariant collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X. If Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X and Φ has a closed measurable (w.r.t. the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$) $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set K in $\mathcal{D}$, then Φ has a unique periodic $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{D}$ with period T, i.e., $\mathcal{A}(\theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2) = \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)$.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 2.23 that Φ has a unique $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{D}$ which is given by (2.46) and (2.47). We may use either (2.46) or (2.47) to prove Theorem 2.24. We here use the latter to first prove $\mathcal{A}(\theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2) \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ for all $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$.

Fix $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$ and take $y \in \mathcal{A}(\theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2)$. It follows from (2.47) that there exists a $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbit ψ of Φ such that $y = \psi(0, \theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2)$. Since ψ is a complete orbit of Φ, for any $t \geq 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{\omega}_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\tilde{\omega}_2 \in \Omega_2$, we have

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{1,\tau+T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \theta_{2,\tau}\tilde{\omega}_2, \psi(\tau, \theta_{1,T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2)) = \psi(t + \tau, \theta_{1,T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2). \tag{2.48}$$

Since ψ is a $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbit, there exists $D \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$\psi(t, \theta_{1,T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2) \in D(\theta_{1,t+T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \theta_{2,t}\tilde{\omega}_2) = D_T(\theta_{1,t}\tilde{\omega}_1, \theta_{2,t}\tilde{\omega}_2), \tag{2.49}$$

where D_T is the T-translation of D given by (2.4). We now define a map $u : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \to X$ such that

$$u(t, \tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2) = \psi(t, \theta_{1,T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2), \quad \forall\, t \in \mathbb{R},\ \forall\, \tilde{\omega}_1 \in \Omega_1,\ \forall\, \tilde{\omega}_2 \in \Omega_2. \tag{2.50}$$

We next prove u is a complete orbit of Φ. It follows from (2.50) that for all $t \geq 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{\omega}_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\tilde{\omega}_2 \in \Omega_2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(t, \theta_{1,\tau}\tilde{\omega}_1, \theta_{2,\tau}\tilde{\omega}_2, u(\tau, \tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2)) &= \Phi(t, \theta_{1,\tau}\tilde{\omega}_1, \theta_{2,\tau}\tilde{\omega}_2, \psi(\tau, \theta_{1,T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2)) \\ &= \Phi(t, \theta_{1,\tau+T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \theta_{2,\tau}\tilde{\omega}_2, \psi(\tau, \theta_{1,T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2)) \\ &= \psi(t+\tau, \theta_{1,T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2) = u(t+\tau, \tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2),\end{aligned} \tag{2.51}$$

where we have used the T-periodicity of Φ, (2.48) and (2.50). By (2.51) we see that u is a complete orbit of Φ. We now prove that u is actually a $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbit. It follows from (2.49) and (2.50) that for all $t \geq 0$, $\tilde{\omega}_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\tilde{\omega}_2 \in \Omega_2$,

$$u(t, \tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2) = \psi(t, \theta_{1,T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2) \in D_T(\theta_{1,t}\tilde{\omega}_1, \theta_{2,t}\tilde{\omega}_2). \tag{2.52}$$

Since $D \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ is T-translation invariant, we know $D_T \in \mathcal{D}$, which along with (2.52) shows that u is a $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbit. Then it follows from (2.47) that $u(0, \omega_1, \omega_2) \in \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)$. By (2.50) we have $u(0, \omega_1, \omega_2) = \psi(0, \theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2) = y$. Therefore we get $y \in \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)$. Since y is an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{A}(\theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2)$ we find that

$$\mathcal{A}(\theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2) \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2), \qquad \text{for all } \omega_1 \in \Omega_1 \text{ and } \omega_2 \in \Omega_2. \tag{2.53}$$

We now prove the converse of (2.53). Let $y \in \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)$. By (2.47) we find that there exists a $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbit ψ of Φ such that $y = \psi(0, \omega_1, \omega_2)$. Since ψ is a complete orbit, for any $t \geq 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{\omega}_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\tilde{\omega}_2 \in \Omega_2$, we have

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{1,\tau-T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \theta_{2,\tau}\tilde{\omega}_2, \psi(\tau, \theta_{1,-T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2)) = \psi(t+\tau, \theta_{1,-T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2). \tag{2.54}$$

Since ψ is a $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbit, there exists $D \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$\psi(t, \theta_{1,-T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2) \in D(\theta_{1,t-T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \theta_{2,t}\tilde{\omega}_2) = D_{-T}(\theta_{1,t}\tilde{\omega}_1, \theta_{2,t}\tilde{\omega}_2). \tag{2.55}$$

Define a map $v : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \to X$ such that

$$v(t, \tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2) = \psi(t, \theta_{1,-T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2), \quad \forall\, t \in \mathbb{R},\ \forall\, \tilde{\omega}_1 \in \Omega_1,\ \forall\, \tilde{\omega}_2 \in \Omega_2. \tag{2.56}$$

By using the T-periodicity of Φ, (2.54) and (2.56), following the proof for u, we can show that v is a complete orbit of Φ. In addition, by (2.55) and (2.56), we find that for all $t \geq 0$, $\tilde{\omega}_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\tilde{\omega}_2 \in \Omega_2$,

$$v(t, \tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2) = \psi(t, \theta_{1,-T}\tilde{\omega}_1, \tilde{\omega}_2) \in D_{-T}(\theta_{1,t}\tilde{\omega}_1, \theta_{2,t}\tilde{\omega}_2). \tag{2.57}$$

Since $D \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ is T-translation invariant, it follows from Lemma 2.7 that $D_{-T} \in \mathcal{D}$, which along with (2.57) shows that v is a $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbit. Then it follows from (2.47) that $v(0, \theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2) \in \mathcal{A}(\theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2)$. But by (2.56) we have $v(0, \theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2) = \psi(0, \omega_1, \omega_2) = y$. Thus we obtain $y \in \mathcal{A}(\theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2)$, from which we get that $\mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2) \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2)$. This along with (2.53) concludes the proof. □

We now provide a sufficient and necessary criterion for the periodicity of random attractors based on the existence of periodic pullback absorbing sets.

Theorem 2.25. *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a neighborhood closed collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X. Suppose Φ is a continuous periodic cocycle with period $T > 0$ on X over $(\Omega_1, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$. Suppose further that Φ has a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{D}$. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is periodic with period T if and only if Φ has a closed measurable (w.r.t. the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$) $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set $K \in \mathcal{D}$ with K being periodic with period T.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{A}$ is T-periodic, i.e., for every $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$,

$$\mathcal{A}(\theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2) = \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2). \tag{2.58}$$

Since $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ is neighborhood closed, by the proof of Lemma 2.20 we know that Φ has a closed measurable $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set $K \in \mathcal{D}$ which is given by (2.34). By (2.58) and (2.34) we find that, for every $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$,

$$K(\theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2) = \{x \in X : d(x, \mathcal{A}(\theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2)) \leq \varepsilon_1\} = \{x \in X : d(x, \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2)) \leq \varepsilon_1\} = K(\omega_1, \omega_2).$$

and hence K is periodic with period T.

On the other hand, if Φ has a closed measurable $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set $K \in \mathcal{D}$ such that K is T-periodic, then by (2.14), Theorem 2.23 and the T-periodicity of Φ we have, for every $\omega_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\omega_2 \in \Omega_2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}(\theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2) = \Omega(K, \theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \omega_2) &= \bigcap_{\tau\geq 0} \overline{\bigcup_{t\geq\tau} \Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}\theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2, K(\theta_{1,-t}\theta_{1,T}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2))} \\ &= \bigcap_{\tau\geq 0} \overline{\bigcup_{t\geq\tau} \Phi(t, \theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2, K(\theta_{1,-t}\omega_1, \theta_{2,-t}\omega_2))} = \Omega(K, \omega_1, \omega_2) = \mathcal{A}(\omega_1, \omega_2).\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\mathcal{A}$ is T-periodic and thus completes the proof. □

3 Pullback Attractors for Differential Equations

In this section, we discuss how to choose the parametric spaces Ω_1 and Ω_2 to study pullback attractors of differential equations by using the abstract theory presented in the preceding section. Actually, the concept of continuous cocycle given by Definition 2.1 is motivated by the solution operators of differential equations with both external non-autonomous deterministic and stochastic terms. Two special cases are covered by Definition 2.1: one is the solution operators generated by equations with only deterministic forcing terms; and the other is the process generated by equations with only stochastic forcing terms. In this sense, Definition 2.1 is an extension of the classical concepts of autonomous, deterministic non-autonomous and random dynamical systems. Indeed, These classical concepts can be cast into the framework of Definition 2.1 by appropriately choosing the spaces Ω_1 and Ω_2. To deal with autonomous differential equations, we may simply take both Ω_1 and Ω_2 as singletons (say, $\Omega_1 = \{\omega_1^*\}$ and $\Omega_2 = \{\omega_2^*\}$), and define $\theta_{1,t}\omega_1^* = \omega_1^*$ and $\theta_{2,t}\omega_2^* = \omega_2^*$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then a continuous cocycle Φ in X in terms of Definition 2.1 is exactly a classical continuous autonomous dynamical system as defined in the literature (see, e.g., [3, 20, 25, 26]). In this case, if we define

$$\mathcal{D} = \{D = \{D(\omega_1^*, \omega_2^*) : D(\omega_1^*, \omega_2^*) \text{ is a bounded nonempty subset of } X\}\}, \tag{3.1}$$

then the concept of a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor given by Definition 2.15 coincides with that of a global attractor of Φ. Note that when $\Omega_1 = \{\omega_1^*\}$ and $\Omega_2 = \{\omega_2^*\}$ are singletons, every member D of $\mathcal{D}$ as defined by (3.1) is also a singleton, i.e., D contains a single bounded nonempty set. Therefore, in this case, D does not depend on time since $\theta_{1,t}$ and $\theta_{2,t}$ are both constant for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies that $\mathcal{D}$ given by (3.1) is inclusion-closed. Actually, it is also neighborhood closed. In the case of autonomous systems, Theorem 2.23 is well known. Next, we discuss the non-autonomous systems and random systems in detail.

3.1 Pullback Attractors for Equations with both Non-autonomous Deterministic and Random Forcing Terms

In this subsection, we discuss pullback attractors for differential equations with non-autonomous deterministic as well as stochastic terms. In this case, there are at least two options for choosing the space Ω_1 to formulate the solution operators of an equation into the setting of cocycles. To demonstrate the idea, the pullback attractors of Reaction-Diffusion equations defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$ will be investigated in the next section. For non-autonomous equations, the space Ω_1 is used to deal with the dependence of solutions on initial times. So the first choice of Ω_1 is $\mathbb{R}$, where $\mathbb{R}$ represents the set of all initial times. For the second choice of Ω_1, we need to use the translations of non-autonomous parameters involved in differential equations which may be non-autonomous coefficients or external terms or both. Let $f : \mathbb{R} \to X$ be a function that is contained in a differential equation. Given $h \in \mathbb{R}$, define $f^h : \mathbb{R} \to X$ by $f^h(\cdot) = f(\cdot + h)$. The function f^h is actually a translation of f by h. Let Ω_f be the collection of all translations of f, that is, $\Omega_f = \{f^h : h \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Then the second choice of Ω_1 is Ω_f. In the sequel, we first discuss the case $\Omega_1 = \mathbb{R}$ and then $\Omega_1 = \Omega_f$. As we will see later, these two approaches are actually equivalent provided f is not a periodic function.

Suppose now $\Omega_1 = \mathbb{R}$. Define a family $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ of shift operators by

$$\theta_{1,t}(h) = h + t, \quad \text{for all} \;\; t, \; h \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.2}$$

Let Φ: $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_2 \times X \to X$ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\mathbb{R}, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$, where $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is defined by (3.2). By Definition 2.8, a map ψ: $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_2 \to X$ is a complete orbit of Φ if for every $t \geq 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega_2$, the following holds:

$$\Phi(t, \tau + s, \theta_{2,\tau}\omega, \psi(\tau, s, \omega)) = \psi(t + \tau, s, \omega). \tag{3.3}$$

Let $\xi : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_2 \to X$ satisfy, for all $t \geq 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega_2$,

$$\Phi(t, \tau, \omega, \xi(\tau, \omega)) = \xi(t + \tau, \theta_{2,t}\omega). \tag{3.4}$$

Any function $\xi : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_2 \to X$ with property (3.4) is said to be a complete quasi-solution of Φ in the sense of (3.4). If, in addition, there exists $D = \{D(t, \omega) : t \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\xi(t, \omega) \in D(t, \omega)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega_2$, then, we say ξ is a $\mathcal{D}$-complete quasi-solution of Φ in the sense of (3.4). If $\psi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_2 \to X$ is a complete orbit of Φ according to Definition 2.8, then for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$, it is easy to check that the map ξ^s: $(\tau, \omega) \in \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_2 \to \psi(\tau - s, s, \theta_{2,s-\tau}\omega)$ is a complete quasi-solution of Φ in the sense of (3.4). Further, $\xi^s(s, \omega) = \psi(0, s, \omega)$. Similarly, if $\xi : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_2 \to X$ is a complete quasi-solution of Φ under (3.4), then the map $\psi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_2 \to X$ defined by

$$\psi(t, s, \omega) = \xi(t + s, \theta_{2,t}\omega), \quad \text{for all} \;\; t, \; s \in \mathbb{R} \;\text{ and } \omega \in \Omega_2, \tag{3.5}$$

is a complete orbit of Φ in the sense of (3.3). In addition, $\psi(0, s, \omega) = \xi(s, \omega)$. Using (3.3)-(3.5) and applying Theorem 2.23 to the case $\Omega_1 = \mathbb{R}$, we get the following result.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a neighborhood closed collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X and Φ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\mathbb{R}, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$, where $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is defined by (3.2). Then Φ has a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X and Φ has a closed measurable (w.r.t. the P-completion of*

$\mathcal{F}_2$) $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set K in $\mathcal{D}$. The $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A}$ is unique and is given by, for each $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega_2$,

$$\mathcal{A}(\tau,\omega) = \Omega(K,\tau,\omega) = \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{D}} \Omega(B,\tau,\omega) \tag{3.6}$$

$$= \{\psi(0,\tau,\omega) : \psi \textit{ is a } \mathcal{D}\textit{-complete orbit of } \Phi \textit{ under Definition } (2.8)\} \tag{3.7}$$

$$= \{\xi(\tau,\omega) : \xi \textit{ is a } \mathcal{D}\textit{-complete quasi-solution of } \Phi \textit{ in the sense of } (3.4)\}. \tag{3.8}$$

We now consider periodic pullback attractors. Let $T > 0$ and Φ be a periodic cocycle with period T, that is, for every $t \geq 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega_2$, $\Phi(t,\tau+T,\omega,\cdot) = \Phi(t,\tau,\omega,\cdot)$. Then it follows from Theorems 2.24 and 2.25 that the $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor of Φ is also periodic under certain circumstances.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose Φ is a continuous periodic cocycle with period $T > 0$ on X over $(\mathbb{R}, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$, where $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is defined by (3.2). Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a neighborhood closed and T-translation invariant collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X. If Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X and Φ has a closed measurable (w.r.t. the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$) $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set K in $\mathcal{D}$, then Φ has a unique periodic $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{D}$ with period T, i.e., for each $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega_2$, $\mathcal{A}(\tau+T,\omega) = \mathcal{A}(\tau,\omega)$.*

We now discuss the second approach to deal with non-autonomous equations by taking $\Omega_1 = \Omega_f$, where $f : \mathbb{R} \to X$ is a parameter contained in an equation. Note that for any $h_1,\ h_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $h_1 \neq h_2$, we have $f^{h_1} \neq f^{h_2}$ as long as f is not periodic in X. In this case, we can define a group $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ acting on Ω_f by

$$\theta_{1,t} f^h = f^{t+h} \quad \text{for all } \ t \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{and } \ f^h \in \Omega_f. \tag{3.9}$$

If f is a periodic function with minimal period $T > 0$, then $\Omega_f = \Omega_f^T$, where $\Omega_f^T = \{f^h : 0 \leq h < T\}$. For each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we define a map $\theta_{1,t}$: $\Omega_f^T \to \Omega_f^T$ such that for each $0 \leq h < T$,

$$\theta_{1,t} f^h = f^\tau, \tag{3.10}$$

where $\tau \in [0,T)$ is the unique number such that $t + h = mT + \tau$ for some integer m. Then $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ given by (3.10) is a group acting on Ω_f^T for a periodic f with minimal period T.

We first consider the case where f is not periodic in X. Let Φ: $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega_f \times \Omega_2 \times X \to X$ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega_f, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$, where $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is defined by (3.9). Suppose ψ: $\mathbb{R} \times \Omega_f \times \Omega_2 \to X$ is a complete orbit of Φ, that is, for every $t \geq 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $f^h \in \Omega_f$ and $\omega \in \Omega_2$,

$$\Phi(t, f^{\tau+h}, \theta_{2,\tau}\omega, \psi(\tau, f^h, \omega)) = \psi(t + \tau, f^h, \omega). \tag{3.11}$$

Let $\xi : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_2 \to X$ satisfy, for all $t \geq 0$, $f^h \in \Omega_f$ and $\omega \in \Omega_2$,

$$\Phi(t, f^h, \omega, \xi(h, \omega)) = \xi(t + h, \theta_{2,t}\omega). \tag{3.12}$$

Such a function ξ is called a complete quasi-solution of Φ in the sense of (3.12). If, in addition, there exists $D = \{D(f^t, \omega) : f^t \in \Omega_f, \omega \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\xi(t, \omega) \in D(f^t, \omega)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega_2$, then, we say ξ is a $\mathcal{D}$-complete quasi-solution of Φ in the sense of (3.12). If $\psi : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_f \times \Omega_2 \to X$ is a $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbit of Φ by Definition 2.8, then for every $h \in \mathbb{R}$, we can show that the map ξ^h: $(\tau, \omega) \in \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_2 \to \psi(\tau - h, f^h, \theta_{2,h-\tau}\omega)$ is a $\mathcal{D}$-complete quasi-solution of Φ in the sense of (3.12). Vice versa, if $\xi : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_2 \to X$ is a $\mathcal{D}$-complete quasi-solution of Φ by (3.12), then the map $\psi : (t, f^h, \omega) \in \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_f \times \Omega_2 \to \xi(t + h, \theta_{2,t}\omega)$ is a $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbit of Φ in terms of Definition 2.8, and $\psi(0, f^h, \omega) = \xi(h, \omega)$. Thus, we have the following result from Theorem 2.23.

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose $f : \mathbb{R} \to X$ is not a periodic function. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a neighborhood closed collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X and Φ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega_f, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$, where $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is defined by (3.9). Then Φ has a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X and Φ has a closed measurable (w.r.t. the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$) $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set K in $\mathcal{D}$. The $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A}$ is unique and is given by, for each $f^h \in \Omega_f$ and $\omega \in \Omega_2$,*

$$\mathcal{A}(f^h, \omega) = \Omega(K, f^h, \omega) = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{D}} \Omega(B, f^h, \omega)$$

$$= \{\psi(0, f^h, \omega) : \psi \ \ \textit{is a} \ \ \mathcal{D}\textit{−complete orbit of}\ \Phi \ \ \textit{under Definition}\ (2.8)\}$$

$$= \{\xi(h, \omega) : \xi \ \textit{is a} \ \ \mathcal{D}\textit{−complete quasi-solution of}\ \Phi\ \textit{in the sense of}\ \ (3.12)\}.$$

We next examine the relations between Propositions 3.1 and 3.3. In this respect, we will prove that these two propositions are essentially the same if f is not a periodic function. Suppose Φ is a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega_f, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ with $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ being given by (3.9). Then we can associate with Φ another continuous cocycle $\tilde{\Phi}$: $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_2 \times X \to X$ by

$$\tilde{\Phi}(t, \tau, \omega, \cdot) = \Phi(t, f^\tau, \omega, \cdot), \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0, \ \tau \in \mathbb{R} \ \text{ and } \ \omega \in \Omega_2. \tag{3.13}$$

Indeed, one can show that $\tilde{\Phi}$ is a continuous cocycle on X over $(\mathbb{R}, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ with $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ being given by (3.2). Suppose that $\mathcal{D} = \{D = \{D(f^h, \omega) : f^h \in \Omega_f, \omega \in \Omega_2\}\}$ is a collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X. Give $D = \{D(f^h, \omega) : f^h \in \Omega_f, \omega \in \Omega_2\} \in \mathcal{D}$, denote by

$$\tilde{D} = \{\tilde{D}(\tau, \omega) : \tilde{D}(\tau, \omega) = D(f^\tau, \omega),\ \tau \in \mathbb{R},\ \omega \in \Omega_2\}. \tag{3.14}$$

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ be the collection corresponding to $\mathcal{D}$ as defined by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}} = \{\tilde{D} : \tilde{D} \text{ is given by (3.14)},\ D \in \mathcal{D}\}.$$

If $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}(f^h, \omega) : f^h \in \Omega_f,\ \omega \in \Omega_2\}$ is the $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor of Φ, then it is easy to check that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R},\ \omega \in \Omega_2\}$ is the $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$-pullback attractor of $\tilde{\Phi}$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\tau, \omega) = \mathcal{A}(f^\tau, \omega)$ for each $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega_2$. The converse of this statement is also true if f is not a periodic function because, in that case, one can define Φ, $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ for given $\tilde{\Phi}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ by the reverse of the above process. However, for periodic f with minimal period $T > 0$, we can not define the collection $\mathcal{D}$ from $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ by the inverse of (3.14) if there are $\tilde{D} \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega_2$ such that $\tilde{D}(\tau, \omega) \neq \tilde{D}(\tau + T, \omega)$. In this case, we can take $\Omega_1 = \Omega_f^T$ with $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ being given by (3.10). Then applying Theorem 2.23, we find the following result.

Proposition 3.4. *Suppose $f : \mathbb{R} \to X$ is periodic with minimal period $T > 0$. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a neighborhood closed collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X and Φ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega_f^T, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}})$, where $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is defined by* (3.10). *Then Φ has a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X and Φ has a closed measurable (w.r.t. the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}_2$) $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set K in $\mathcal{D}$. The $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A}$ is unique and is given by, for each $f^h \in \Omega_f^T$ and $\omega \in \Omega_2$,*

$$\mathcal{A}(f^h, \omega) = \Omega(K, f^h, \omega) = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{D}} \Omega(B, f^h, \omega)$$

$$= \{\psi(0, f^h, \omega) : \psi \ \textit{ is a } \ \mathcal{D}-\textit{complete orbit of } \Phi \ \textit{ under Definition } (2.8)\}$$

$$= \{\xi(h, \omega) : \xi \textit{ is a } \ \mathcal{D}-\textit{complete quasi-solution of } \Phi \textit{ in the sense of } \ (3.12)\}.$$

Note that the $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}(f^h, \omega) : h \in [0, T), \omega \in \Omega_2\}$ of Φ obtained in Proposition 3.4 can be extended to a periodic attractor by setting, for every $h \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega_2$, $\mathcal{A}(f^h, \omega) = \mathcal{A}(f^\tau, \omega)$ with $\tau \in [0, T)$ such that $h = mT + \tau$ for some integer m.

3.2 Attractors for Equations with only Random Forcing Terms

To deal with differential equations with only stochastic forcing terms but without non-autonomous deterministic terms, we may take $\Omega_1 = \{\omega^*\}$ as a singleton, and define $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ by $\theta_{1,t}\omega^* = \omega^*$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. In this case, Definition 2.1 is the same as the concept of cocycles as introduced in [1, 16, 18, 24]. We now drop the dependence of all variables on Ω_1 and write $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ as $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \{\theta_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$. For the reader's convenience, we rephrase Theorem 2.23 as follows.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a neighborhood closed collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X and Φ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \{\theta_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$. Then Φ has a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X and Φ has a closed measurable (w.r.t. the P-completion of $\mathcal{F}$) $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set K in $\mathcal{D}$. The $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A}$ is unique and is given by, for each $\omega \in \Omega$,*

$$\mathcal{A}(\omega) = \Omega(K, \omega) = \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{D}} \Omega(B, \omega)$$

$$= \{\psi(0, \omega) : \psi \textit{ is a } \mathcal{D}-\textit{complete orbit of } \Phi \ \ \textit{under Definition } (2.8)\}.$$

It is worth noticing that, in the case where Ω_1 is a singleton, a map ψ: $\mathbb{R}\times\Omega_2 \to X$ is a complete orbit of Φ by Definition 2.8 if and only if for each $t \geq 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega_2$, there holds

$$\Phi(t, \theta_{2,\tau}\omega, \psi(\tau, \omega)) = \psi(t + \tau, \omega). \tag{3.15}$$

In other words, if a system contains only random forcing without other non-autonomous deterministic forcing, then the concept of a complete orbit of the system should be defined by (3.15). Note that (3.15) is different from (3.4) and that is why a function with property (3.4) is called a complete quasi-solution instead of a solution.

As mentioned in the Introduction, if the cocycle Φ is compact in the sense that it has a compact $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set, then the existence of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractors of Φ was proved in [18]. The compactness of Φ was later replaced by the $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotic compactness and the existence of attractors in this case was proved in [5]. Under further assumptions that $\mathcal{D}$ is neighborhood closed, Proposition 3.5 shows that the $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotic compactness and the existence of closed measurable $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing sets of Φ are not only sufficient, but also necessary for existence of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractors. In addition, Proposition 3.5 provides a characterization of pullback attractors in terms of the $\mathcal{D}$-complete orbits of Φ.

3.3 Attractors for Non-autonomous Deterministic Systems

As a special case of systems with both deterministic and random terms as discussed in Section 3.1, we now consider the systems with only non-autonomous deterministic parameters. Of course, all results presented in Section 3.1 are valid in this special case. Because pullback attractors for non-autonomous deterministic systems are interesting in their own right, it is worth to rewrite the main results of Section 3.1 for this specific case.

To handle non-autonomous deterministic systems, we may take $\Omega_2 = \{\omega^*\}$ as a singleton and either $\Omega_1 = \mathbb{R}$ or $\Omega_1 = \Omega_f$. Suppose $\Omega_2 = \{\omega^*\}$ is a singleton. Let P be the probability on $(\{\omega^*\}, \mathcal{F}_2)$ with $\mathcal{F}_2 = \{\{\omega^*\}, \emptyset\}$. For all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, set $\theta_{2,t}\omega^* = \omega^*$. We first consider the case where $\Omega_1 = \mathbb{R}$ with $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ being given by (3.2). Since Ω_2 is a singleton, from now on, we will drop the dependence of all variables on Ω_2.

Let Φ: $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times X \to X$ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\mathbb{R}, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ with $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ being given by (3.2). The existence of pullback attractors for such Φ has been investigated by many authors in [9, 10, 35] and the references therein. Our results here will provide not only sufficient but also necessary criteria for existence of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractors.

Let ψ: $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to X$ be a a complete orbit of Φ in the sense of Definition 2.8, that is, for every $t \geq 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, there holds:

$$\Phi(t, \tau + s, \psi(\tau, s)) = \psi(t + \tau, s). \tag{3.16}$$

Let $\xi : \mathbb{R} \to X$ satisfy, for all $t \geq 0$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\Phi(t, \tau)\xi(\tau) = \xi(t + \tau). \tag{3.17}$$

In the literature, any ξ with property (3.17) is called a complete solution of Φ, see, e.g., [4, 13, 26]. If there exists $D = \{D(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\} \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\xi(t) \in D(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then we say ξ is a $\mathcal{D}$-complete solution of Φ in the sense of (3.17). Our definition (3.16) is different but closely related to (3.17). Actually, if $\psi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to X$ has property (3.16), then for every fixed $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\xi^s(\cdot) = \psi(\cdot - s, s)$ maps $\mathbb{R}$ into X with property (3.17). In other words, for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$, ξ^s is a complete solution in the sense of (3.17), and $\xi^s(s) = \psi(0, s)$. Similarly, given $\xi : \mathbb{R} \to X$ with property (3.17), define a map $\psi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to X$ by

$$\psi(t, s) = \xi(t + s), \quad \text{for all } \ t, \ s \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.18}$$

Then ψ is a complete orbit of Φ in the sense of (3.16). It follows from (3.18) and Lemma 2.18 that, if Φ has a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}(\tau) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}\}$, then for every $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathcal{A}(\tau) = \{\xi(\tau) : \xi \text{ is a } \ \mathcal{D}\text{−complete solution in the sense of } \ (3.17)\}. \tag{3.19}$$

The characterization of $\mathcal{A}$ given by (3.19) can be found in [13] for non-autonomous deterministic equations, where $\mathcal{A}$ is called kernel sections instead of pullback attractors. By dropping the dependence of variables on Ω_2, we have the following result from Proposition 3.1.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a neighborhood closed collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X and Φ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\mathbb{R}, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ with $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ given by* (3.2)*. Then Φ has a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X and Φ has a closed $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set K in $\mathcal{D}$. The $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}(\tau)\}_{\tau\in\mathbb{R}}$ is unique and is given by, for each $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}(\tau) = \Omega(K, \tau) = \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{D}} \Omega(B, \tau)& \\ = \{\psi(0, \tau) : \psi \ \textit{ is a } \ \mathcal{D}-\textit{complete orbit of } \Phi \ \textit{ under Definition } (2.8)\}& \\ = \{\xi(\tau) : \xi \textit{ is a } \ \mathcal{D}-\textit{complete solution of } \Phi \textit{ in the sense of } \ (3.17)\}.&\end{aligned}$$

In the case where Φ is a periodic cocycle with period T (i.e., $\Phi(t, s+T, \cdot) = \Phi(t, s, \cdot)$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$), Proposition 3.2 implies the result below.

Proposition 3.7. *Suppose Φ is a continuous periodic cocycle with period $T > 0$ on X over $(\mathbb{R}, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ with $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ given by* (3.2)*. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a neighborhood closed and T-translation invariant collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X. If Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X and Φ has a closed $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set K in $\mathcal{D}$, then Φ has a unique periodic $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}(\tau)\}_{\tau\in\mathbb{R}} \in \mathcal{D}$, that is, for each $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{A}(\tau + T) = \mathcal{A}(\tau)$.*

We now discuss the case where $\Omega_2 = \{\omega^*\}$ is a singleton and $\Omega_1 = \Omega_f$. Suppose $f : \mathbb{R} \to X$ is not a periodic function. Let Φ: $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega_f \times \{\omega^*\} \times X \to X$ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega_f, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\{\omega^*\}, \mathcal{F}_2, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$, where $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is given by (3.9). For convenience, we drop the dependence of variables on Ω_2 from now on. Suppose ψ: $\mathbb{R} \times \Omega_f \to X$ is a complete orbit of Φ in the sense of Definition 2.8, i.e., for every $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $t \geq 0$ and $f^h \in \Omega_f$,

$$\Phi(t, f^{\tau+h}, \psi(\tau, f^h)) = \psi(t + \tau, f^h). \tag{3.20}$$

Let $\xi : \mathbb{R} \to X$ satisfy, for all $t \geq 0$ and $f^h \in \Omega_f$,

$$\Phi(t, f^h)\xi(h) = \xi(t + h). \tag{3.21}$$

If, in addition, there exists $D = \{D(f^t) : f^t \in \Omega_f\} \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\xi(t) \in D(f^t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then, we say ξ is a $\mathcal{D}$-complete solution of Φ in the sense of (3.21). If $\psi : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_f \to X$ is a complete orbit of Φ in the sense of Definition 2.8, then by (3.20), for every fixed $h \in \mathbb{R}$, $\xi^h(\cdot) = \psi(\cdot - h, f^h)$ is a complete orbit of Φ in the sense of (3.21) and $\xi^h(h) = \psi(0, f^h)$. Similarly, if $\xi : \mathbb{R} \to X$ is a complete solution of Φ under (3.21), then the mapping $\psi : (t, f^h) \in \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_f \to \psi(t, f^h) = \xi(t + h)$ is a complete solution of Φ under Definition 2.8 and $\psi(0, f^h) = \xi(h)$. Thus, as a special case of Proposition 3.3 with $\Omega_2 = \{\omega^*\}$, we have the following result.

Proposition 3.8. *Suppose $f : \mathbb{R} \to X$ is not a periodic function. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a neighborhood closed collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X and Φ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega_f, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ with $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ given by* (3.9)*. Then Φ has a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X and Φ has a closed $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set K in $\mathcal{D}$. The $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}(f^h)\}_{f^h\in\Omega_f}$ is unique and is given by, for each $f^h \in \Omega_f$,*

$$\mathcal{A}(f^h) = \Omega(K, f^h) = \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{D}} \Omega(B, f^h)$$

$$= \{\psi(0, f^h) : \psi \ \textit{ is a } \ \mathcal{D}-\textit{complete orbit of } \Phi \ \textit{ under Definition } (2.8)\}$$

$$= \{\xi(h) : \xi \textit{ is a } \ \mathcal{D}-\textit{complete solution of } \Phi \textit{ in the sense of } \ (3.21)\}.$$

Based on the translations of f, the attractors of deterministic equations can also be studied by the skew semigroup method, see, e.g., [13]. The idea of this approach is to lift a cocycle to a semigroup defined in an extended space. Let $C_b(\mathbb{R}, X)$ be the space of bounded continuous functions from $\mathbb{R}$ to X with the supremum norm. Given $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}, X)$, let Σ be the closure of Ω_f with respect to the topology of $C_b(\mathbb{R}, X)$. If Σ is compact, then the skew semigroup method can be used to deduce the existence of non-autonomous attractors under certain circumstances, see [13] for instance. Our approach with $\Omega_1 = \Omega_f$ is different from the skew semigroup method in the sense that we consider the set Ω_f only as a parametric space; neither the boundedness of f, nor the precompactness of Ω_f, is needed. This is why Proposition 3.8 could be applied to an unbounded f with even exponentially growing rate as $t \to \pm\infty$.

Note that Propositions 3.6 and 3.8 are essentially the same as long as f is not a periodic function. This follows from the discussions presented in Section 3.1 by setting $\Omega_2 = \{\omega^*\}$. For periodic f, we have the following result from Proposition 3.4.

Proposition 3.9. *Suppose $f : \mathbb{R} \to X$ is periodic with minimal period $T > 0$. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a neighborhood closed collection of some families of nonempty subsets of X and Φ be a continuous cocycle on X over $(\Omega_f^T, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$, where $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is defined by* (3.10)*. Then Φ has a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X and Φ has a closed $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set K in $\mathcal{D}$. The $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A}$ is unique and is given by, for each $f^h \in \Omega_f^T$,*

$$\mathcal{A}(f^h) = \Omega(K, f^h) = \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{D}} \Omega(B, f^h)$$

$$= \{\psi(0, f^h) : \psi \ \textit{ is a } \ \mathcal{D}-\textit{complete orbit of } \Phi \ \textit{ under Definition } (2.8)\}$$

$$= \{\xi(h) : \xi \textit{ is a } \ \mathcal{D}-\textit{complete solution of } \Phi \textit{ in the sense of } \ (3.21)\}.$$

4 Pullback Attractors for Reaction-Diffusion Equations

As an application of our main results, in this section, we study pullback attractors for Reaction-Diffusion equations defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with both non-autonomous deterministic and stochastic forcing terms. We first define a continuous cocycle for the equation in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and then prove the pullback asymptotic compactness of solutions as well as the existence of pullback absorbing sets. We will also discuss periodic pullback attractors of the equation when the deterministic forcing terms are periodic functions in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

4.1 Cocycles for Reaction-Diffusion Equations on $\mathbb{R}^n$

Given $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t > \tau$, consider the following non-autonomous Reaction-Diffusion equation defined for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$du + (\lambda u - \Delta u)dt = f(x,u)dt + g(x,t)dt + h(x)d\omega, \tag{4.1}$$

with the initial data

$$u(x,\tau) = u_\tau(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{4.2}$$

where λ is a positive constant, $g \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}, L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$, $h \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \bigcap W^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $p \geq 2$, ω is a two-sided real-valued Wiener process on a probability space. The nonlinearity f is a smooth function that satisfies, for some positive constants α_1, α_2 and α_3,

$$f(x,s)s \leq -\alpha_1 |s|^p + \psi_1(x), \quad \forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \ \ \forall\, s \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.3}$$

$$|f(x,s)| \leq \alpha_2 |s|^{p-1} + \psi_2(x), \quad \forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \ \ \forall\, s \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.4}$$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial s}(x,s) \leq \alpha_3, \quad \forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \ \ \forall\, s \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.5}$$

$$|\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,s)| \leq \psi_3(x), \quad \forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \ \ \forall\, s \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.6}$$

where $\psi_1 \in L^1(R^n) \cap L^\infty(R^n)$ and $\psi_2, \psi_3 \in L^2(R^n)$.

To describe the probability space that will be used in this paper, we write

$$\Omega = \{\omega \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) : \ \omega(0) = 0\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the Borel σ-algebra induced by the compact-open topology of Ω, and P be the corresponding Wiener measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$. Define a group $\{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ acting on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ by

$$\theta_{2,t}\omega(\cdot) = \omega(\cdot + t) - \omega(t), \quad \omega \in \Omega, \ \ t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.7}$$

Then $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ is a parametric dynamical system.

Let $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be the group acting on $\mathbb{R}$ given by (3.2). We next define a continuous cocycle for equation (4.1) over $(\mathbb{R}, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$. This can be done by first transferring the stochastic equation into a corresponding non-autonomous deterministic one. Given $\omega \in \Omega$, denote by

$$z(\omega) = -\lambda \int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\lambda\tau} \omega(\tau) d\tau. \tag{4.8}$$

Then it is easy to check that the random variable z given by (4.8) is a stationary solution of the one-dimensional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck equation:

$$dz + \lambda z dt = dw.$$

In other words, we have

$$dz(\theta_{2,t}\omega) + \lambda z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)dt = dw. \tag{4.9}$$

It is known that there exists a $\theta_{2,t}$-invariant set $\tilde{\Omega} \subseteq \Omega$ of full P measure such that $z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)$ is continuous in t for every $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$, and the random variable $|z(\omega)|$ is tempered (see, e.g., [1, 15, 16]). Hereafter, we will not distinguish $\tilde{\Omega}$ and Ω, and write $\tilde{\Omega}$ as Ω.

Formally, if u solves equation (4.1), then the variable $v(t) = u(t) - hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega)$ should satisfy

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + \lambda v - \Delta v = f(x, v + hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega)) + g(x,t) + z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\Delta h, \tag{4.10}$$

for $t > \tau$ with $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Since (4.10) is a deterministic equation, following the arguments of [26], one can show that under (4.3)-(4.6), for each $\omega \in \Omega$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v_\tau \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, equation (4.10) has a unique solution $v(\cdot, \tau, \omega, v_\tau) \in C([\tau, \infty), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)) \bigcap L^2((\tau, \tau+T); H^1(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $v(\tau, \tau, \omega, v_\tau) = v_\tau$ for every $T > 0$. Furthermore, for each $t \geq \tau$, $v(t, \tau, \omega, v_\tau)$ is $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)))$-measurable in $\omega \in \Omega$ and continuous in v_τ with respect to the norm of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let $u(t, \tau, \omega, u_\tau) = v(t, \tau, \omega, v_\tau) + hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega)$ with $u_\tau = v_\tau + hz(\theta_{2,\tau}\omega)$. Then we find that u is continuous in both $t \geq \tau$ and $u_\tau \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and is $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)))$-measurable in $\omega \in \Omega$. In addition, it follows from (4.10) that u is a solution of problem (4.1)-(4.2). We now define a cocycle $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for the stochastic problem (4.1)-(4.2). Given $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $u_\tau \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, set

$$\Phi(t, \tau, \omega, u_\tau) = u(t + \tau, \tau, \theta_{2,-\tau}\omega, u_\tau) = v(t + \tau, \tau, \theta_{2,-\tau}\omega, v_\tau) + hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega), \tag{4.11}$$

where $v_\tau = u_\tau - hz(\omega)$. By the properties of u, it is easy to check that Φ is a continuous cocycle on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ over $(\mathbb{R}, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$, where $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ and $\{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ are given by (3.2) and (4.7), respectively. In other words, the mapping Φ given by (4.11) satisfies all conditions (i)-(iv) in Definition 2.1. In what follows, we establish uniform estimates for the solutions of problem

(4.1)-(4.2) and prove the existence of pullback attractors for ϕ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. To this end, we first need to specify a collection $\mathcal{D}$ of families of subsets of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Let B be a bounded nonempty subset of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and denote by $\|B\| = \sup\limits_{\varphi \in B} \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$. Suppose $D = \{D(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\}$ is a family of bounded nonempty subsets of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying, for every $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{s \to -\infty} e^{\lambda s} \|D(\tau + s, \theta_{2,s}\omega)\|^2 = 0, \tag{4.12}$$

where λ is as in (4.1). Denote by $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$ the collection of all families of bounded nonempty subsets of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ which fulfill condition (4.12), i.e.,

$$\mathcal{D}_\lambda = \{D = \{D(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\} : \ D \text{ satisfies } (4.12)\}. \tag{4.13}$$

It is evident that $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$ is neighborhood closed. The following condition will be needed when deriving uniform estimates of solutions:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\tau} e^{\lambda s} \|g(\cdot, s)\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} ds < \infty, \quad \forall\, \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.14}$$

which implies that

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} \int_{|x| \geq k} e^{\lambda s} |g(x, s)|^2 dx ds = 0, \quad \forall\, \tau \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.15}$$

Notice that condition (4.14) does not require that g be bounded in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ when $s \to \pm\infty$. Particularly, this condition has no any restriction on $g(\cdot, s)$ when $s \to +\infty$.

4.2 Uniform Estimates of Solutions

In this section, we derive uniform estimates of solutions of problem (4.1)-(4.2) which are needed for proving the existence of $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$-pullback absorbing sets and the $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$-pullback asymptotic compactness of the cocycle Φ. Especially, we will show that the tails of solutions are uniformly small for large space and time variables. The estimates of solutions in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are provided below.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose* (4.3)-(4.6) *and* (4.14) *hold. Then for every* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ *and* $D = \{D(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\} \in \mathcal{D}_\lambda$, *there exists* $T = T(\tau, \omega, D) > 0$ *such that for all* $t \geq T$, *the solution* v *of equation* (4.10) *with* ω *replaced by* $\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega$ *satisfies*

$$\|v(\tau, \tau - t, \theta_{2,-\tau}\omega, v_{\tau - t})\|^2 \leq M + M e^{-\lambda \tau} \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} e^{\lambda s} \|g(\cdot, s)\|^2 ds + M \int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\lambda s} |z(\theta_{2,s}\omega)|^p ds,$$

and

$$\int_{\tau - t}^{\tau} e^{\lambda s} \left(\|v(s, \tau - t, \theta_{2,-\tau}\omega, v_{\tau - t})\|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|v(s, \tau - t, \theta_{2,-\tau}\omega, v_{\tau - t}) + hz(\theta_{2,s-\tau}\omega)\|^p_p \right) ds$$

$$\leq Me^{\lambda\tau} + M\int_{-\infty}^{\tau} e^{\lambda s}\|g(\cdot,s)\|^2 ds + Me^{\lambda\tau}\int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\lambda s}|z(\theta_{2,s}\omega)|^p ds,$$

where $v_{\tau-t} \in D(\tau - t, \theta_{2,-t}\omega)$ and M is a positive constant depending on λ, but independent of τ, ω and D.

Proof. It follows from (4.10) that

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|v\|^2 + \lambda\|v\|^2 + \|\nabla v\|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x, v + hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega))\ v dx + (g, v) + z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)(\Delta h, v). \tag{4.16}$$

By (4.3) and (4.4), the first term on the right-hand side of (4.16) satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x, v + hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega))\ v dx$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x, v + hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega))\ (v + hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega)))dx - z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x, v + hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega))\ h(x)dx$$

$$\leq -\alpha_1\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v + hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega)|^p dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\psi_1(x)dx$$

$$+\alpha_2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |v + hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega)|^{p-1}\ |hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega)|dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}|\psi_2|\ |hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega)|dx$$

$$\leq -\frac{1}{2}\alpha_1\|v + hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\|_p^p + c_1(1 + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)|^p), \tag{4.17}$$

where we have used Young's inequality to obtain (4.17). Note that the last two terms on the right-hand side of (4.16) are bounded by

$$\|g\|\|v\| + \|z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\nabla h\|\|\nabla v\| \leq \frac{1}{4}\lambda\|v\|^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\|g\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\nabla h\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla v\|^2. \tag{4.18}$$

By (4.16)-(4.18) we find that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|v\|^2 + \frac{3}{2}\lambda\|v\|^2 + \|\nabla v\|^2 + \alpha_1\|v + hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\|_p^p \leq \frac{2}{\lambda}\|g\|^2 + c_2(1 + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)|^p). \tag{4.19}$$

Multiplying (4.19) by $e^{\lambda t}$ and then integrating the resulting inequality on $(\tau - t, \tau)$ with $t \geq 0$, we get that for every $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\|v(\tau, \tau - t, \omega, v_{\tau-t})\|^2 + \int_{\tau-t}^{\tau} e^{\lambda(s-\tau)}\|\nabla v(s, \tau - t, \omega, v_{\tau-t})\|^2 ds$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}\lambda\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau} e^{\lambda(s-\tau)}\|v(s, \tau - t, \omega, v_{\tau-t})\|^2 ds + \alpha_1\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau} e^{\lambda(s-\tau)}\|v(s, \tau - t, \omega, v_{\tau-t}) + hz(\theta_{2,s}\omega)\|_p^p ds$$

$$\leq e^{-\lambda t}\|v_{\tau-t}\|^2 + \frac{2}{\lambda}e^{-\lambda\tau}\int_{-\infty}^{\tau} e^{\lambda s}\|g(\cdot,s)\|^2 ds + c_3 + c_3\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau} e^{\lambda(s-\tau)}|z(\theta_{2,s}\omega)|^p ds.$$

Replacing ω by $\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega$, we find that

$$\|v(\tau,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2+\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau}e^{\lambda(s-\tau)}\|\nabla v(s,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2ds$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}\lambda\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau}e^{\lambda(s-\tau)}\|v(s,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2+\alpha_1\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau}e^{\lambda(s-\tau)}\|v(s,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})+hz(\theta_{2,s-\tau}\omega)\|_p^p$$

$$\le e^{-\lambda t}\|v_{\tau-t}\|^2+\frac{2}{\lambda}e^{-\lambda\tau}\int_{-\infty}^{\tau}e^{\lambda s}\|g(\cdot,s)\|^2ds+c_3+c_3\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau}e^{\lambda(s-\tau)}|z(\theta_{2,s-\tau}\omega)|^pds$$

$$\le e^{-\lambda t}\|v_{\tau-t}\|^2+\frac{2}{\lambda}e^{-\lambda\tau}\int_{-\infty}^{\tau}e^{\lambda s}\|g(\cdot,s)\|^2ds+c_3+c_3\int_{-\infty}^{0}e^{\lambda s}|z(\theta_{2,s}\omega)|^pds. \tag{4.20}$$

Since $v_{\tau-t}\in D(\tau-t,\theta_{2,-t}\omega)$ we see that

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty}e^{-\lambda t}\|v_{\tau-t}\|^2\le\limsup_{t\to\infty}e^{-\lambda t}\|D(\tau-t,\theta_{2,-t}\omega)\|^2=0.$$

Therefore, there exists $T=T(\tau,\omega,D)>0$ such that for all $t\ge T$, $e^{-\lambda t}\|v_{\tau-t}\|^2\le 1$, which along with (4.20) completes the proof. $\square$

As a consequence of Lemma 4.1, we have the following inequality which is useful for deriving the uniform estimates of solutions in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose* (4.3)-(4.6) *and* (4.14) *hold. Then for every* $\tau\in\mathbb{R}$, $\omega\in\Omega$ *and* $D=\{D(\tau,\omega):\tau\in\mathbb{R},\omega\in\Omega\}\in\mathcal{D}_\lambda$, *there exists* $T=T(\tau,\omega,D)\ge 1$ *such that for all* $t\ge T$, *the solution* v *of equation* (4.10) *with* ω *replaced by* $\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega$ *satisfies*

$$\int_{\tau-1}^{\tau}\left(\|\nabla v(s,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2+\|v(s,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})+hz(\theta_{2,s-\tau}\omega)\|_p^p\right)ds$$

$$\le M+Me^{-\lambda\tau}\int_{-\infty}^{\tau}e^{\lambda s}\|g(\cdot,s)\|^2ds+M\int_{-\infty}^{0}e^{\lambda s}|z(\theta_{2,s}\omega)|^pds,$$

where $v_{\tau-t}\in D(\tau-t,\theta_{2,-t}\omega)$ *and* M *is a positive constant depending on* λ, *but independent of* τ, ω *and* D.

Proof. By Lemma 4.1 we see that there exists $T=T(\tau,\omega,D)\ge 1$ such that for all $t\ge T$,

$$\int_{\tau-1}^{\tau}e^{\lambda s}\left(\|\nabla v(s,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2+\|v(s,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})+hz(\theta_{2,s-\tau}\omega)\|_p^p\right)ds$$

$$\le\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau}e^{\lambda s}\left(\|\nabla v(s,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2+\|v(s,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})+hz(\theta_{2,s-\tau}\omega)\|_p^p\right)ds$$

$$\le Me^{\lambda\tau}+M\int_{-\infty}^{\tau}e^{\lambda s}\|g(\cdot,s)\|^2ds+Me^{\lambda\tau}\int_{-\infty}^{0}e^{\lambda s}|z(\theta_{2,s}\omega)|^pds$$

Note that $e^{\lambda s}\ge e^{\lambda\tau}e^{-\lambda}$ for all $s\ge\tau-1$. Thus Lemma 4.2 follows immediately. $\square$

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose* (4.3)-(4.6) *and* (4.14) *hold. Then for every* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ *and* $D = \{D(\tau,\omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\} \in \mathcal{D}_\lambda$, *there exists* $T = T(\tau,\omega,D) \geq 1$ *such that for all* $t \geq T$, *the solution* v *of equation* (4.10) *with* ω *replaced by* $\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega$ *satisfies*

$$\|\nabla v(\tau,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2 \leq M + Me^{-\lambda\tau}\int_{-\infty}^{\tau} e^{\lambda s}\|g(\cdot,s)\|^2 ds + M\int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\lambda s}|z(\theta_{2,s}\omega)|^p ds,$$

where $v_{\tau-t} \in D(\tau-t,\theta_{2,-t}\omega)$ *and* M *is a positive constant depending on* λ, *but independent of* τ, ω *and* D.

Proof. Multiplying (4.10) by Δv and then integrating the equation we get

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|\nabla v\|^2 + \lambda\|\nabla v\|^2 + \|\Delta v\|^2 = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x, v + hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega))\Delta v dx - (g + z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\Delta h, \Delta v). \quad (4.21)$$

By (4.4)-(4.6) we have the following estimates for the nonlinear term:

$$\begin{aligned}
-\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x, v + hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega))\, \Delta v dx &= -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x,u)\, \Delta u dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x,u)\, z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\Delta h dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,u)\, \nabla u dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(x,u)\, |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x,u)\, z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\Delta h dx \\
&\leq \|\psi_3\|\|\nabla u\| + \beta\|\nabla u\|^2 + \alpha_2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u|^{p-1}\, |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\Delta h| dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\psi_2(x)|\, |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\Delta h| dx \\
&\leq c_1\left(\|\nabla v + z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\nabla h\|^2 + \|v + z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)h\|_p^p\right) + c_1\left(1 + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)|^p\right). \\
&\leq c_2\left(\|\nabla v\|^2 + \|v\|_p^p\right) + c_2\left(1 + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)|^p\right).
\end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

Note that the last term on the right-hand side of (4.21) is bounded by

$$|(g,\Delta v)| + |(z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\Delta h, \Delta v)| \leq \frac{1}{2}\|\Delta v\|^2 + \|g\|^2 + \|z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\Delta h\|^2. \quad (4.23)$$

It follows from (4.21)-(4.23) that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\nabla v\|^2 + 2\lambda\|\nabla v\|^2 + \|\Delta v\|^2 \leq c_2\left(\|\nabla v\|^2 + \|v\|_p^p\right) + \|g\|^2 + c_3\left(1 + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)|^p\right),$$

which implies that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\nabla v\|^2 \leq c_2\left(\|\nabla v\|^2 + \|v\|_p^p\right) + \|g\|^2 + c_3\left(1 + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)|^p\right). \quad (4.24)$$

Given $t \geq 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $s \in (\tau-1,\tau)$, integrating (4.24) on (s,τ) we get

$$\|\nabla v(\tau,\tau-t,\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2 \leq \|\nabla v(s,\tau-t,\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2 + c_3\int_s^{\tau}(1 + |z(\theta_{2,\xi}\omega)|^p)d\xi$$

$$+c_2\int_s^\tau \left(\|\nabla v(\xi,\tau-t,\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2+\|v(\xi,\tau-t,\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|_p^p\right)d\xi+\int_s^\tau \|g(\cdot,\xi)\|^2 d\xi.$$

Integrating the above with respect to s on $(\tau-1,\tau)$, we obtain that

$$\|\nabla v(\tau,\tau-t,\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2\le\int_{\tau-1}^\tau \|\nabla v(s,\tau-t,\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2 ds+c_3\int_{\tau-1}^\tau (1+|z(\theta_{2,\xi}\omega)|^p)d\xi$$

$$+c_2\int_{\tau-1}^\tau \left(\|\nabla v(\xi,\tau-t,\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2+\|v(\xi,\tau-t,\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|_p^p\right)d\xi+\int_{\tau-1}^\tau \|g(\cdot,\xi)\|^2 d\xi.$$

Now replacing ω by $\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega$, we get that

$$\|\nabla v(\tau,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2\le\int_{\tau-1}^\tau \|\nabla v(s,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2 ds+c_3\int_{\tau-1}^\tau (1+|z(\theta_{2,\xi-\tau}\omega)|^p)d\xi$$

$$+c_2\int_{\tau-1}^\tau \left(\|\nabla v(\xi,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2+\|v(\xi,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|_p^p\right)d\xi+\int_{\tau-1}^\tau \|g(\cdot,\xi)\|^2 d\xi.$$

Let $T=T(\tau,\omega,D)\ge 1$ be the positive number found in Lemma 4.2. Then it follows from the above inequality and Lemma 4.2 that, for all $t\ge T$,

$$\|\nabla v(\tau,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})\|^2\le c_4+c_4e^{-\lambda\tau}\int_{-\infty}^\tau e^{\lambda s}\|g(\cdot,s)\|^2 ds$$

$$+c_4\int_{-\infty}^0 e^{\lambda s}|z(\theta_{2,s}\omega)|^p ds+c_4\int_{\tau-1}^\tau |z(\theta_{2,s-\tau}\omega)|^p ds+\int_{\tau-1}^\tau \|g(\cdot,s)\|^2 ds. \tag{4.25}$$

Note that the last two terms on the right-hand side of (4.25) can be controlled by the first three terms. Indeed, we have

$$\int_{\tau-1}^\tau |z(\theta_{2,s-\tau}\omega)|^p ds=\int_{-1}^0 |z(\theta_{2,s}\omega)|^p ds\le e^\lambda\int_{-\infty}^0 e^{\lambda s}|z(\theta_{2,s}\omega)|^p ds. \tag{4.26}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\int_{\tau-1}^\tau \|g(\cdot,s)\|^2 ds\le e^\lambda e^{-\lambda\tau}\int_{\tau-1}^\tau e^{\lambda s}\|g(\cdot,s)\|^2 ds\le e^\lambda e^{-\lambda\tau}\int_{-\infty}^\tau e^{\lambda s}\|g(\cdot,s)\|^2 ds. \tag{4.27}$$

Thus, Lemma 4.3 follows from (4.25)-(4.27). □

We now derive uniform estimates on the tails of solutions for large space and time variables. Such estimates are essential for proving the asymptotic compactness of equations defined on unbounded domains.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose* (4.3)-(4.6) *and* (4.14) *hold. Let* $\tau\in\mathbb{R}$, $\omega\in\Omega$ *and* $D=\{D(\tau,\omega):\tau\in\mathbb{R},\omega\in\Omega\}\in\mathcal{D}_\lambda$. *Then for every* $\eta>0$, *there exist* $T=T(\tau,\omega,D,\eta)\ge 1$ *and* $K=K(\tau,\omega,\eta)\ge 1$ *such that for all* $t\ge T$, *the solution* v *of equation* (4.10) *with* ω *replaced by* $\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega$ *satisfies*

$$\int_{|x|\ge K}|v(\tau,\tau-t,\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega,v_{\tau-t})(x)|^2 dx\le\eta,$$

where $v_{\tau-t}\in D(\tau-t,\theta_{2,-t}\omega)$.

Proof. Let ρ be a smooth function defined on $\mathbb{R}^+$ such that $0 \le \rho(s) \le 1$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}^+$, and

$$\rho(s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } 0 \le s \le 1; \\ 1 & \text{for } s \ge 2. \end{cases}$$

Note that ρ' is bounded on $\mathbb{R}^+$. Multiplying (4.10) by $\rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})v$ and then integrating the equation, we get

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})|v|^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})|v|^2 dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) v \Delta v dx$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x,u)\rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) v dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (g + z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\Delta h)\, \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) v dx. \tag{4.28}$$

We first estimate the term involving Δv, for which we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) v \Delta v dx = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla v|^2 \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v \rho'(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) \frac{2x}{k^2} \cdot \nabla v dx$$

$$\le -\int_{k \le |x| \le \sqrt{2}k} v\rho'(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) \frac{2x}{k^2} \cdot \nabla v dx \le \frac{c_1}{k} \int_{k \le |x| \le \sqrt{2}k} |v|\ |\nabla v| dx \le \frac{c_1}{k}(\|v\|^2 + \|\nabla v\|^2). \tag{4.29}$$

Dealing with the nonlinear term as in (4.17), by (4.3) and (4.4) we can verify that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x,u)\rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) v dx \le -\frac{1}{2}\alpha_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u|^p \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi_1 \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) dx$$

$$+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi_2^2 \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) dx + c_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(|z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)h|^p + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)h|^2 \right) \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) dx. \tag{4.30}$$

In addition, the last term on the right-hand side of (4.28) satisfies

$$|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (g + z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\Delta h)\rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) v dx| \le \frac{1}{2}\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})|v|^2 dx + \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (g^2 + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\Delta h|^2)\rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) dx. \tag{4.31}$$

Thus, it follows from (4.28)-(4.31) that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})|v|^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})|v|^2 dx$$

$$\le \frac{c_3}{k}(\|\nabla v\|^2 + \|v\|^2) + c_3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(|\psi_1| + |\psi_2|^2 + g^2 \right) \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) dx$$

$$+ c_3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(|z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\Delta h|^2 + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)h|^2 + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)h|^p \right) \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) dx. \tag{4.32}$$

Since $\psi_1 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, given $\eta_0 > 0$, there exists $K_1 = K_1(\eta_0) \ge 1$ such that for all $k \ge K_1$,

$$c_3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\psi_1| \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) dx = c_3 \int_{|x| \ge k} |\psi_1| \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}) dx \le c_3 \int_{|x| \ge k} |\psi_1(x)| dx \le \eta_0. \tag{4.33}$$

Similarly, since $\psi_2 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $h \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^n)\bigcap W^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, there exists $K_2 = K_2(\eta_0) \geq K_1$ such that for all $k \geq K_2$,

$$c_3 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(|\psi_2|^2 + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)\Delta h|^2 + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)h|^2 + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)h|^p\right) \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})dx$$

$$\leq \eta_0(1 + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)|^2 + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)|^p) \leq c_4\eta_0(1 + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)|^p). \tag{4.34}$$

It follows from (4.32)-(4.34) that there exists $K_3 = K_3(\eta_0) \geq K_2$ such that for all $k \geq K_3$

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})|v|^2dx + \lambda\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})|v|^2dx$$

$$\leq \eta_0(\|\nabla v\|^2 + \|v\|^2) + c_5\eta_0(1 + |z(\theta_{2,t}\omega)|^p) + c_3\int_{|x|\geq k} g^2(x,t)dx.$$

Multiplying the above by $e^{\lambda t}$ and then integrating the inequality on $(\tau - t, \tau)$ with $t \geq 0$, we get that for each $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})|v(\tau, \tau - t, \omega, v_{\tau-t})|^2dx - e^{-\lambda t}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})|v_{\tau-t}(x)|^2dx$$

$$\leq \eta_0 e^{-\lambda\tau}\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau} e^{\lambda s}\|v(s, \tau - t, \omega, v_{\tau-t})\|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}ds + \frac{c_5\eta_0}{\lambda}$$

$$+ c_5\eta_0\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau} e^{\lambda(s-\tau)}|z(\theta_{2,s}\omega)|^pds + c_3\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau}\int_{|x|\geq k} e^{\lambda(s-\tau)}g^2(x,s)dxds. \tag{4.35}$$

Replacing ω by $\theta_{2,-\tau}\omega$ in (4.35) we find that, for $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $t \geq 0$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $k \geq K_3$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})|v(\tau, \tau - t, \theta_{2,-\tau}\omega, v_{\tau-t})|^2dx - e^{-\lambda t}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})|v_{\tau-t}(x)|^2dx$$

$$\leq \eta_0 e^{-\lambda\tau}\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau} e^{\lambda s}\|v(s, \tau - t, \theta_{2,-\tau}\omega, v_{\tau-t})\|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}ds + \frac{c_5\eta_0}{\lambda}$$

$$+c_5\eta_0\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau} e^{\lambda(s-\tau)}|z(\theta_{2,s-\tau}\omega)|^pds + c_3\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau}\int_{|x|\geq k} e^{\lambda(s-\tau)}g^2(x,s)dxds$$

$$\leq \eta_0 e^{-\lambda\tau}\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau} e^{\lambda s}\|v(s, \tau - t, \theta_{2,-\tau}\omega, v_{\tau-t})\|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}ds + \frac{c_5\eta_0}{\lambda}$$

$$+ c_5\eta_0\int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\lambda s}|z(\theta_{2,s}\omega)|^pds + c_3\int_{-\infty}^{\tau}\int_{|x|\geq k} e^{\lambda(s-\tau)}g^2(x,s)dxds. \tag{4.36}$$

By (4.15) we see that there exists $K_4 = K_4(\tau, \eta_0) \geq K_3$ such that for all $k \geq K_4$,

$$c_3\int_{-\infty}^{\tau}\int_{|x|\geq k} e^{\lambda(s-\tau)}g^2(x,s)dxds \leq \eta_0. \tag{4.37}$$

It follows from (4.36)-(4.37) and Lemma 4.1 that there exists $T_1 = T_1(\tau, \omega, D) > 0$ such that for all $t \geq T_1$ and $k \geq K_4$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})|v(\tau, \tau - t, \theta_{2,-\tau}\omega, v_{\tau-t})|^2 dx - e^{-\lambda t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})|v_{\tau-t}(x)|^2 dx$$

$$\leq c_6\eta_0 + c_6\eta_0 \int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\lambda s}|z(\theta_{2,s}\omega)|^p ds + c_6\eta_0 \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} e^{\lambda(s-\tau)}\|g(\cdot, s)\|^2 ds. \tag{4.38}$$

Since $v_{\tau-t} \in D(\tau - t, \theta_{2,-t}\omega)$ and $D \in \mathcal{D}_\lambda$ we find that

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} e^{-\lambda t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})|v_{\tau-t}(x)|^2 dx \leq \limsup_{t\to\infty} e^{-\lambda t}\|D(\tau - t, \theta_{2,-t}\omega)\|^2 = 0,$$

which along with (4.38) implies that there exists $T_2 = T_2(\tau, \omega, D, \eta_0) \geq T_1$ such that for all $t \geq T_2$ and $k \geq K_4$,

$$\int_{|x|\geq\sqrt{2}k} |v(\tau, \tau - t, \theta_{2,-\tau}\omega, v_{\tau-t})|^2 dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2})|v(\tau, \tau - t, \theta_{2,-\tau}\omega, v_{\tau-t})|^2 dx$$

$$\leq c_7\eta_0 \left(1 + \int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\lambda s}|z(\theta_{2,s}\omega)|^p ds + \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} e^{\lambda(s-\tau)}\|g(\cdot, s)\|^2 ds\right). \tag{4.39}$$

Then Lemma 4.4 follows from (4.39) by choosing η_0 appropriately for a given $\eta > 0$. □

We are now ready to derive uniform estimates on the solutions u of the stochastic equation (4.1) based on those estimates of the solutions v of equation (4.10). By (4.11) we find that, for each $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $t \geq 0$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$u(\tau, \tau - t, \theta_{2,-\tau}\omega, u_{\tau-t}) = v(\tau, \tau - t, \theta_{2,-\tau}\omega, v_{\tau-t}) + hz(\omega), \tag{4.40}$$

where $v_{\tau-t} = u_{\tau-t} - hz(\theta_{2,-t}\omega)$. Let $D = \{D(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\} \in \mathcal{D}_\lambda$. We then define another family $\tilde{D}$ of subsets of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ from D. Given $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, set

$$\tilde{D}(\tau, \omega) = \{\varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) : \|\varphi\|^2 \leq 2\|D(\tau, \omega)\|^2 + 2|z(\omega)|^2\|h\|^2\}. \tag{4.41}$$

Let $\tilde{D}$ be the family consisting of those sets given by (4.41), i.e.,

$$\tilde{D} = \{\tilde{D}(\tau, \omega) : \tilde{D}(\tau, \omega) \text{ is defined by (4.41)}, \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\}. \tag{4.42}$$

Since $|z(\omega)|$ is tempered and $D \in \mathcal{D}_\lambda$, it is easy to check that $\tilde{D}$ given by (4.42) also belongs to $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$. Furthermore, if $u_{\tau-t} \in D(\tau - t, \theta_{2,-t}\omega)$, then $v_{\tau-t} = u_{\tau-t} - hz(\theta_{2,-t}\omega)$ belongs to $\tilde{D}(\tau - t, \theta_{2,-t}\omega)$. Based on the above analysis, the uniform estimates in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of the solutions of equation (4.1) follows immediately from (4.40), Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.3.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose* (4.3)-(4.6) *and* (4.14) *hold. Then for every* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ *and* $D = \{D(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\} \in \mathcal{D}_\lambda$*, there exists* $T = T(\tau, \omega, D) \geq 1$ *such that for all* $t \geq T$*, the solution* u *of problem* (4.1)-(4.2) *satisfies*

$$\|u(\tau, \tau - t, \theta_{2,-\tau}\omega, u_{\tau-t})\|^2 \leq \beta(1 + z^2(\omega)) + \beta e^{-\lambda\tau} \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} e^{\lambda s}\|g(\cdot, s)\|^2 ds + \beta \int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\lambda s}|z(\theta_{2,s}\omega)|^p ds, \tag{4.43}$$

where $u_{\tau-t} \in D(\tau - t, \theta_{2,-t}\omega)$ *and* β *is a positive constant depending on* λ*, but independent of* τ, ω *and* D*.*

Similarly, by (4.40) and Lemma 4.4, we have the following uniform estimates on the tails of solutions of equation (4.1).

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose* (4.3)-(4.6) *and* (4.14) *hold. Let* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ *and* $D = \{D(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\} \in \mathcal{D}_\lambda$*. Then for every* $\eta > 0$*, there exist* $T = T(\tau, \omega, D, \eta) \geq 1$ *and* $K = K(\tau, \omega, \eta) \geq 1$ *such that for all* $t \geq T$*, the solution* u *of problem* (4.1)-(4.2) *satisfies*

$$\int_{|x| \geq K} |u(\tau, \tau - t, \theta_{2,-\tau}\omega, u_{\tau-t})(x)|^2 dx \leq \eta,$$

where $u_{\tau-t} \in D(\tau - t, \theta_{2,-t}\omega)$*.*

4.3 Existence of Attractors for Reaction-Diffusion Equations

In this subsection, we establish the existence of a $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$-pullback attractor for the cocycle Φ associated with the stochastic problem (4.1)-(4.2). We first notice that, by Lemma 4.5, Φ has a closed $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$-pullback absorbing set K in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. More precisely, given $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, let $K(\tau, \omega) = \{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) : \|u\|^2 \leq L(\tau, \omega)\}$, where $L(\tau, \omega)$ is the constant given by the right-hand side of (4.43). It is evident that, for each $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $L(\tau, \cdot) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$-measurable. In addition, by simple calculations, one can verify that

$$\lim_{r \to -\infty} e^{\lambda r}\|K(\tau + r, \theta_{2,r}\omega)\|^2 = \lim_{r \to -\infty} e^{\lambda r} L(\tau + r, \theta_{2,r}\omega) = 0.$$

In other words, $K = \{K(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$. For every $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $D \in \mathcal{D}_\lambda$, it follows from Lemma 4.5 that there exists $T = T(\tau, \omega, D) \geq 1$ such that for all $t \geq T$,

$$\Phi(t, \tau - t, \theta_{2,-t}\omega, D(\tau - t, \theta_{2,-t}\omega)) \subseteq K(\tau, \omega).$$

Thus we find that $K = \{K(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\}$ is a closed measurable $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$-pullback absorbing set in $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$ for Φ. We next show that Φ is $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$-pullback asymptotically compact in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Lemma 4.7. *Suppose* (4.3)-(4.6) *and* (4.14) *hold. Then* Φ *is* $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$*-pullback asymptotically compact in* $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$*, that is, for every* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$*,* $\omega \in \Omega$*,* $D = \{D(\tau,\omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\} \in \mathcal{D}_\lambda$*, and* $t_n \to \infty$*,* $u_{0,n} \in D(\tau - t_n, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega)$*, the sequence* $\Phi(t_n, \tau - t_n, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega, u_{0,n})$ *has a convergent subsequence in* $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$*.*

Proof. We need to show that for every $\eta > 0$, the sequence $\Phi(t_n, \tau - t_n, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega, u_{0,n})$ has a finite covering of balls of radii less than η. Given $K > 0$, denote by $Q_K = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| \le K\}$ and $Q_K^c = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus Q_K$. It follows from Lemma 4.6 that there exist $K = K(\tau,\omega,\eta) \ge 1$ and $N_1 = N_1(\tau,\omega,D,\eta) \ge 1$ such that for all $n \ge N_1$,

$$\|\Phi(t_n, \tau - t_n, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega, u_{0,n})\|_{L^2(Q_K^c)} \le \frac{\eta}{2}. \tag{4.44}$$

By Lemma 4.5 there exists $N_2 = N_2(\tau,\omega,D,\eta) \ge N_1$ such that for all $n \ge N_2$,

$$\|\Phi(t_n, \tau - t_n, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega, u_{0,n})\|_{H^1(Q_K)} \le L(\tau,\omega),$$

where $L(\tau,\omega)$ is the constant given by the right-hand side of (4.43). By the compactness of embedding $H^1(Q_K) \hookrightarrow L^2(Q_K)$, the sequence $\Phi(t_n, \tau - t_n, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega, u_{0,n})$ is precompact in $L^2(Q_K)$, and hence it has a finite covering in $L^2(Q_K)$ of balls of radii less than $\frac{\eta}{2}$. This and (4.44) imply that $\Phi(t_n, \tau - t_n, \theta_{2,-t_n}\omega, u_{0,n})$ has a finite covering in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of balls of radii less than η, as desired. $\square$

So far, we have proved the $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$-pullback asymptotic compactness and the existence of a closed measurable $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$-pullback absorbing set of Φ. Thus the existence of a $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$-pullback attractor of Φ follows from Proposition 3.1 immediately.

Theorem 4.8. *Suppose* (4.3)-(4.6) *and* (4.14) *hold. Then the cocycle* Φ *associated with problem* (4.1)-(4.2) *has a unique* $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$*-pullback attractor* $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{D}_\lambda$ *in* $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *whose structure is characterized by* (3.6)-(3.8)*.*

We now consider the case where the non-autonomous deterministic forcing $g : \mathbb{R} \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}, L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and is periodic with period $T > 0$. In this case, condition (4.14) is fulfilled, and for every $t \ge 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, we have from (4.11) that

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(t, \tau + T, \omega, \cdot) &= v(t + \tau + T, \tau + T, \theta_{2,-\tau-T}\omega, \ \cdot - hz(\omega)) + hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega) \\ &= v(t + \tau, \tau, \theta_{2,-\tau}\omega, \ \cdot - hz(\omega)) + hz(\theta_{2,t}\omega) = \Phi(t, \tau, \omega, \cdot).\end{aligned}$$

This shows that Φ is periodic with period T by Definition 2.2. Let $D \in \mathcal{D}_\lambda$ and D_T be the T-translation of D. Then by (4.12) and (4.13) we have, for every $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{s \to -\infty} e^{\lambda s} \|D(r + s, \theta_{2,s}\omega)\|^2 = 0. \tag{4.45}$$

In particular, for $r = \tau + T$ with $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, we get from (4.45) that

$$\lim_{s \to -\infty} e^{\lambda s} \| D_T(\tau + s, \theta_{2,s}\omega) \|^2 = \lim_{s \to -\infty} e^{\lambda s} \| D(\tau + T + s, \theta_{2,s}\omega) \|^2 = 0. \tag{4.46}$$

From (4.46) we see that $D_T \in \mathcal{D}_\lambda$, and hence $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$ is T-translation closed. By the same argument, we also see that $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$ is $-T$-translation closed. Thus, from Lemma 2.7 we find that $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$ is T-translation invariant. Applying Proposition 3.2 to problem (4.1)-(4.2), we get the periodicity of the $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$-pullback attractor of Φ as stated below. Note that the periodicity of the attractor can also be obtained by Theorem 2.25.

Theorem 4.9. *Let $g : \mathbb{R} \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be periodic with period $T > 0$ and belong to $L^2((0,T), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Suppose* (4.3)-(4.6) *hold. Then the cocycle Φ associated with problem* (4.1)-(4.2) *has a unique periodic $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{D}_\lambda$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ whose structure is characterized by* (3.6)-(3.8).

As discussed in Section 3.1, the pullback attractors of problem (4.1)-(4.2) can also be investigated by constructing a cocycle over the set Ω_g of all translations of the function g. Given $t \geq 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, let $u(t, 0, g^\tau, \omega, u_0)$ be the solution of equation (4.1) with g being replaced by g^τ. Here, u_0 is the initial condition of u at $t = 0$. Suppose $g : \mathbb{R} \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is not a periodic function. Then define a map $\tilde{\Phi} : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega_g \times \Omega \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by $\tilde{\Phi}(t, g^\tau, \omega, u_0) = u(t, 0, g^\tau, \omega, u_0)$ for all $t \geq 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. One can check that $\tilde{\Phi}$ is a continuous cocycle in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ over $(\Omega_g, \{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}})$ and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \{\theta_{2,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}})$, where $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is given by (3.9). Actually, $\tilde{\Phi}(t, g^\tau, \omega, \cdot) = \Phi(t, \tau, \omega, \cdot)$ for all $t \geq 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_\lambda$ be the collection of all families $\tilde{D} = \{\tilde{D}(g^\tau, \omega) : g^\tau \in \Omega_g, \omega \in \Omega\}$ such that for every $g^\tau \in \Omega_g$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{s \to -\infty} e^{\lambda s} \| \tilde{D}(g^{\tau + s}, \theta_{2,s}\omega) \|^2 = 0.$$

Then, by Proposition 3.3 we can show that $\tilde{\Phi}$ has a unique $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_\lambda$-pullback attractor $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(g^\tau, \omega) : g^\tau \in \Omega_g, \omega \in \Omega\} \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_\lambda$. Actually, in this case, we have $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(g^\tau, \omega) = \mathcal{A}(\tau, \omega)$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is the $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$-pullback attractor of Φ.

If g is a periodic function with minimal period $T > 0$, then define $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_\lambda$ be the collection of all families $\tilde{D} = \{\tilde{D}(g^\tau, \omega) : g^\tau \in \Omega_g^T, \omega \in \Omega\}$ such that for each $g^\tau \in \Omega_g^T$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{s \to -\infty} e^{\lambda s} \| \tilde{D}(\theta_{1,s} g^\tau, \theta_{2,s}\omega) \|^2 = 0,$$

where $\{\theta_{1,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is given by (3.10). By Proposition 3.4, one can prove that $\tilde{\Phi}$ has a unique $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_\lambda$-pullback attractor $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(g^\tau, \omega) : g^\tau \in \Omega_g^T, \omega \in \Omega\}$. In this case, we also have $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(g^\tau, \omega) = \mathcal{A}(\tau, \omega)$ for all $\tau \in [0, T)$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is the periodic $\mathcal{D}_\lambda$-pullback attractor of Φ.

References

[1] L. Arnold, *Random Dynamical Systems*, Springer-Verlag, 1998.

[2] J.P. Aubin and H. Franskowska, *Set-Valued Analysis*, Birkhauser, Bosten, Basel, Berlin, 1990.

[3] A.V. Babin and M.I. Vishik, *Attractors of Evolution Equations*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1992.

[4] J.M. Ball, Continuity properties and global attractors of generalized semiflows and the Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Nonl. Sci.*, **7** (1997), 475-502.

[5] P.W. Bates, H. Lisei and K. Lu, Attractors for stochastic lattice dynamical systems, *Stoch. Dyn.*, **6** (2006), 1-21.

[6] P.W. Bates, K. Lu and B. Wang, Random attractors for stochastic reaction-diffusion equations on unbounded domains, *J. Differential Equations*, **246** (2009), 845-869.

[7] T. Caraballo, H. Crauel, J. A. Langa and J. C. Robinson, The effect of noise on the Chafee-Infante equation: a nonlinear case study, *Proceedings of AMS*, *135* (2007), 373-382.

[8] T. Caraballo, J. Real, I.D. Chueshov, Pullback attractors for stochastic heat equations in materials with memory, *Discrete Continuous Dynamical Systems B*, **9** (2008), 525-539.

[9] T. Caraballo, G. Lukaszewicz and J. Real, Pullback attractors for asymptotically compact non-autonomous dynamical systems, *Nonlinear Anal.*, **64** (2006), 484-498.

[10] T. Caraballo, G. Lukaszewicz and J. Real, Pullback attractors for non-autonomous 2D-Navier-Stokes equations in some unbounded domains, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris I*, **342** (2006), 263-268.

[11] A. N. Carvalho and J. A. Langa Non-autonomous perturbation of autonomous semilinear differential equations: continuity of local stable and unstable manifolds, *J. Differential Equations*, **233** (2007), 622-653.

[12] A. N. Carvalho and J. A. Langa, An extension of the concept of gradient semigroups which is stable under perturbation, *J. Differential Equations*, **246** (2009), 2646-2668.

[13] V.V. Chepyzhov and M.I. Vishik, Attractors of non-autonomous dynamical systems and their dimensions, *J. Math. Pures. Appl.*, **73** (1994), 279-333.

[14] I. Chueshov and M. Scheutzow, On the structure of attractors and invariant measures for a class of monotone random systems, *Dynamical Systems*, **19** (2004), 127-144.

[15] H. Crauel, A. Debussche and F. Flandoli, Random attractors, *J. Dyn. Diff. Eqns.*, **9** (1997), 307-341.

[16] H. Crauel and F. Flandoli, Attractors for random dynamical systems, *Probab. Th. Re. Fields*, **100** (1994), 365-393.

[17] J. Duan and B. Schmalfuss, The 3D quasigeostrophic fluid dynamics under random forcing on boundary, *Comm. Math. Sci.*, **1** (2003), 133-151.

[18] F. Flandoli and B. Schmalfuβ, Random attractors for the 3D stochastic Navier-Stokes equation with multiplicative noise, *Stoch. Stoch. Rep.*, **59** (1996), 21-45.

[19] L. Gammaitoni, P. Hanggi, P. Jung and F. Marchesoni, Stochastic resonance, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, **70** (1998), 223-287.

[20] J.K. Hale, Asymptotic Behavior of Dissipative Systems, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1988.

[21] J. Huang and W. Shen, Pullback attractors for nonautonomous and random parabolic equations on non-smooth domains, *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, **24** (2009), 855-882.

[22] P.E. Kloeden and J.A. Langa, Flattening, squeezing and the existence of random attractors, *Proc. Royal Soc. London Serie A.*, **463** (2007), 163-181.

[23] F. Moss, D. Pierson and D. O'Gorman, Stochastic resonance: tutorial and update, *Internat. J. Bifur. Chaos Appl. Sci. Engrg.* **4** (1994), 1383-139

[24] B. Schmalfuβ, Backward cocycles and attractors of stochastic differential equations, *International Seminar on Applied Mathematics-Nonlinear Dynamics: Attractor Approximation and Global Behavior*, 1992, 185-192.

[25] R. Sell and Y. You, Dynamics of Evolutionary Equations, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.

[26] R. Temam, Infinite-Dimensional Dynamical Systems in Mechanics and Physics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.

[27] H.C. Tuckwell and J. Jost, The effects of various spatial distributions of weak noise on rhythmic spiking, *J. Comput. Neurosci.*, **30** (2011), 361-371.

[28] H.C. Tuckwell, *Introduction to Theoretical Neurobiology: Volume 2, Nonlinear and Stochastic Theories*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.

[29] B. Wang, Attractors for reaction-diffusion equations in unbounded domains, *Physica D*, **128** (1999), 41-52.

[30] B. Wang, Asymptotic behavior of stochastic wave equations with critical exponents on $\mathbb{R}^3$, *Transactions of American Mathematical Society*, **363** (2011), 3639-3663.

[31] B. Wang, Random Attractors for the Stochastic Benjamin-Bona-Mahony Equation on Unbounded Domains, *J. Differential Equations*, **246** (2009), 2506-2537.

[32] B. Wang, Random attractors for the stochastic FitzHugh-Nagumo system on unbounded domains, *Nonlinear Analysis TMA*, **71** (2009), 2811-2828.

[33] B. Wang, Periodic random attractors for stochastic Navier-Stokes equations on unbounded domains, *Electronic J. Differential Equations*, **2012** (2012), No. 59, 1-18.

[34] B. Wang, Existence, stability and bifurcation of random periodic solutions of stochastic parabolic equations, submitted.

[35] B. Wang, Pullback attractors for non-autonomous reaction-diffusion equations on $\mathbb{R}^n$, *Frontiers of Mathematics in China*, **4** (2009), 563-583.

[36] K. Wiesenfeld, D. Pierson, E. Pantazelou, C. Dames and F. Moss, Stochastic resonance on a circle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72** (1994), 2125-2129.

[37] K. Wiesenfeld and F. Moss, Stochastic resonance and the benefits of noise: from ice ages to crayfish and SQUIDs, *Nature*, **373** (1995), 33-35.